

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

HEARING

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

PROPOSALS TO AMEND OR OTHERWISE MODIFY EXISTING
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS,
INCLUDING THE UNITED NATIONS

PART 3

APRIL 10, 1954
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey	WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia
BOURKE D. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa	THORODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota	J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas
HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan	JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California	GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa
GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HOMER E. CAPEHART, Indiana	MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*

CARL M. MARCY, *Consultant*

JULIUS N. CANN, *Counsel*

PAT M. HOLT, *Consultant*

ALWIN V. FREEMAN, *Consultant*

C. C. O'DAY, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

CREATED PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTIONS 124 AND 125, 81ST CONGRESS

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan	SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California	JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama
JOHN S. COOPER, ¹ Kentucky	GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa
	MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*

CARL MARCY, *Consultant*

FRANCIS H. YALLO, *Staff Associate*

(on loan from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

MONELLA HANSEN, *Research Assistant*

¹ Appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

CONTENTS

Statement of--	Page
Alexander, Bernard, Milwaukee Monthly Meeting of Society of Friends.....	268
Backus, Mrs. August C., Jr., Milwaukee branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	235
Becker, Arthur, University of Wisconsin.....	265
Betz, Frank E., department commander, Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars.....	173
Bitter, Bruno V., attorney.....	199
Bouscaren, Dr. Anthony, chairman, department of political science, Marquette University.....	169
Buchanan, James P., Green Bay, Wis., corporate assistant treasurer.....	292
Chough, Mrs. Ernest T., president, Milwaukee League of Women Voters.....	157
DiVilio, Frank, chairman, Twelfth Ward Regular Republican Club.....	290
Eisendrath, Jack N., Milwaukee Peace Education Committee.....	164
Engelke, Walter, principal, Madison High School, Madison, Wis.....	263
Freeman, Lawrence, Marquette University Young Republicans Club.....	297
Fritschler, John, Jr., attorney.....	220
Giese, Lawrence F., chairman, Wisconsin Committee on United Nations Charter Review.....	225
Goodman, Arnold, Wisconsin branch, United World Federalists.....	234
Gracnder, Charles, Wisconsin and Milwaukee County CIO.....	186
Ihrig, William, attorney.....	223
Jones, Mrs. Sara R., State chairman, national defense, Daughters of the American Revolution.....	208
Kaub, Verne P., president, American Council of Christian Laymen.....	214
Kolb, Mrs. Carl A., Delavan, Wis.....	281
Korb, Thomas W., attorney and businessman.....	181
LaPlante, Edward, member of National Congress of American Indians.....	247
Lanphier, Charles, president, Student Federalists Club of Wauwatosa High School.....	273
Levine, Mrs. Harold, Milwaukee section, National Council of Jewish Women.....	286
Livsey, Miss Grace, chairman, For America Club, Madison, Wis.....	277
Lushbough, L. E., Oconomowoc, Wis.; representing study groups of the YMCA.....	260
Martin, Miss Sue, Methodist Student Movement of State of Wisconsin.....	270
Matake, Walter, instructor, Wauwatosa Senior High School.....	278
McClure, Mrs. Charles, Appleton, Wis.....	295
McNair, Rev. Everett W., minister, Plymouth Congregational Church.....	191
Mercurio, Vincent, Columbus Club.....	239
Morgan, William J., eighteenth ward unit of Republican Party of Milwaukee, Wis., GOP Clubs, Inc.....	194 302
Morris, Dr. Rudolph F., department of sociology, Marquette University.....	241
Mulligan, Wm. J., student, Marquette University High School.....	187
Murphy, Dennis, Milwaukee County Federation of High School Young Republicans.....	178
Neubauer, E. Ted, mechanical engineer, LaCrosse, Wis.....	275
Norlin, Walter T., district attorney, Washburn, Wis.....	239
Olson, Mrs. Hobart.....	287
Parkman, Mrs. Earl.....	245

Statement of—Continued	Page
Perrigo, Burton, American Citizens' League; chairman, Waukesha County Republican Statutory Committee.....	283
Pfankuchen, Llewelyn, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin.....	206
Reece, Rev. Ralph, president, Wisconsin United Nations Association..	161
Reuss, Henry S., Milwaukee County Democratic Party.....	197
Romanik, Mrs. Carl, president, Business and Professional Women's Club of Milwaukee.....	227
Roselien, Gordon W., Wisconsin State commander, American Legion..	159
Seraphim, Christ T., attorney.....	213
Smith, Harvard C., instructor, Mary D. Bradford High School, Kenosha, Wis.....	272
Spurlock, Raymond B., minister, First Methodist Church, Fort Atkinson, Wis.....	229
Treutel, Maj. Alfred A., National Sojourners, Inc.; Military Order of World Wars.....	300
Vest, Robert G., Kenwood branch, Wesley Foundation of Milwaukee.....	291
Weigt, V. J., Advent Christian Church, Baraboo, Wis.....	294
Zawacki, Edmund, professor, University of Wisconsin.....	248
Insertions—	
Excerpt from summary of proceedings, 35th annual convention, American Legion.....	159
Leaflet published by American Council of Christian Laymen.....	215
Letter from Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, Madison, Wis.....	258
Letter from Francis A. Henson, director, educational and political action, UAW of Milwaukee, and attached resolution of UAW-AFL..	259
Statement of Wisconsin Council of Churches.....	306
Memorandum from League of Women Voters of Madison, Wis.....	308
Statement of Madison Monthly Meeting of Society of Friends.....	308
Letter from A. L. Tilton, chairman, Mayor's Committee on Cost of Living, Milwaukee, Wis.....	308
Memorandum from Willette C. Pierce, Milwaukee, Wis.....	309
Statement of Wisconsin division of American Association of University Women.....	309
Memorandum from Rosamond Eliot Rice.....	310
Statement of Herbert Max Jierscheck, Milwaukee, Wis.....	310
Telegram from John C. Love, Waukesha, Wis.....	312
Telegram from Harold Morgan, Merrill, Wis.....	312
Telegram from Rhoda Hamilton, Delavan, Wis.....	312
Telegram from the Milwaukee Board of Realtors.....	312
Letter and enclosure from Mrs. Eugene De Rath, Milwaukee, Wis...	303
Statement of Glenn P. Turner, Madison, Wis.....	317

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER,
Milwaukee, Wis.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a. m., in Plankinton Hall, Milwaukee Auditorium, Milwaukee, Wis., Senator Alexander Wiley (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Wiley, Gillette, and Mansfield.

OPENING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We meet today for one of the most important purposes of any assembly ever held in this great city in the heart land of our Nation.

For the first time in Milwaukee's history, a subcommittee of the United States Senate has come to the people of Wisconsin, on their home grounds, to invite their considered recommendations on an important problem of American foreign policy.

Our purpose today is to secure your suggestions on the revision of the United Nations charter.

The overall mission of our subcommittee is to make, and I quote—a full and complete study of proposals to amend, revise or otherwise modify or change existing international peace and security organizations.

I am happy to introduce my two colleagues, who have taken time from their busy schedules in Washington to be present with us today.

They include the distinguished author of the resolution under which our subcommittee was established, the Honorable Guy Gillette, of Iowa, who sits to my immediate right, as well as my good friend, the Senator from Montana, the Honorable Mike Mansfield, who has given such deep attention to this problem.

In planning for this hearing we have tried to schedule our program and witness list so as to gather as fair, as impartial and objective a view of Wisconsin public opinion as we could achieve.

Over 60 witnesses have asked to be heard. We could not possibly hear them all. Each individual and group, however, may submit a statement of reasonable length for inclusion in the printed record.

I ask the indulgence of our witnesses in recognizing the extremely difficult scheduling problem which has faced our subcommittee. The arrangement of the order of witnesses has been decided by my colleagues and myself, only after very careful consideration.

Before we commence the formal presentation of our testimony, I do want to say how profoundly gratified I am at the tremendous out-

pouring of interest which has been displayed well over Wisconsin on this issue. It is another encouraging demonstration that the people of Wisconsin are keenly aware of their responsibility, that they are keenly aware of the changed world in which we live.

Certainly, the news of the past few days with regard to the H-bomb points out the importance of our citizens joining with their legislators in thinking through these issues, seriously thinking through these issues.

I want now to express my deepest thanks to the Milwaukee Association of Commerce for its generous and continuous cooperation in assisting on the many arrangements for this hearing.

I should like at this time to ask for comments by my colleagues. Senator Gillette, may we have a few words from you, please?

OPENING REMARKS BY SENATOR GILLETTE, SENATOR, STATE OF IOWA

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, a wonderful privilege to be here. Everyone feels that the United Nations organization has not worked out as effectively as the sponsors hoped. The result has been that there has been a growth of minority opinion that we should get out of it, abandon it.

To many of us this seems to be a tragic situation—to abandon the high points that we have reached in the effort to achieve world co-operation for peace and unity. We believe, rather, that we should find what is wrong with it, try to correct it, try to revise it in the coming conference year.

To that end we seek the help of the people of the United States and their viewpoints. We are sampling it in an area of meetings similar to this, under the leadership of your great Senator and our chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

We hope you will help us. We need your guidance. And we hope that we in turn can present it to the State Department and work out an American policy to present in 1955. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield.

OPENING REMARKS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD, SENATOR, STATE OF MONTANA

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege to be back here in the land of the free and home of the Braves. [Laughter.]

It is a privilege especially for both Senator Gillette and I to be here with our distinguished chairman of the committee, and your senior Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

We feel that this is a historic moment because, as the chairman has pointed out, it is not only the first meeting of a committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Milwaukee and Wisconsin, but it is the first time that Senator Wiley is bringing to the people of the United States some of the problems which confront us, and is thereby asking for advice and counsel, so that we collectively can work out a better and a firmer foreign policy.

We certainly want all of you to testify and help us out, because we think that if you help us, in turn we can help those who work with us.

So I am delighted to be here, and I am very happy that this meeting is about to get underway. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, my fellow Senators.

I would like now to call up our fine host, President I. R. Witthuhn, of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. [Applause.]

STATEMENT BY I. R. WITTHUHN, PRESIDENT, MILWAUKEE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. WITTHUHN. Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it certainly is a privilege to express the appreciation to this committee for our being in with this meeting and helping in the arrangements.

We are glad that you are here, and I am expressing the opinion of not only the officers and directors of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, but also our thirty-five hundred members, business firms of this community, who welcome this type of expression.

After all, this is in reality the type of thing that should be done in a republican form of government, and we are glad to see it.

While we have arranged this meeting, we have no responsibility whatever for the agenda, so just always remember that the Milwaukee Association of Commerce arranged the meeting and if you don't have your say as you like it, we in Milwaukee are not responsible, and we want to congratulate this committee on picking out the intelligence center of the United States in holding this meeting. We are very gratified to have been selected as one of the six places in which these meetings are to be held.

I am sure that we and the Senators will gain something from your expressions.

I thank you.

Now, it would not be anything but fitting to have an official welcome at this meeting, we always have one man who very graciously does this, and he does it right down to the queen's taste, and it gives me great pleasure to introduce our mayor, the Honorable Frank Zeidler. [Applause.]

WELCOMING ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK ZEIDLER, MAYOR, CITY OF MILWAUKEE

Mr. ZEIDLER. Thank you, Mr. Witthuhn. I really accept the compliment that you offered the people of the city of Milwaukee by describing this area as one of the intelligence centers of the United States.

I would particularly like to extend the greetings of the city to the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because this is truly a tremendous event for all of us to have this committee come here. It ought to give all of the residents of this city of Milwaukee a great sense of achievement to have the committee come here and to discuss and hold hearings on a matter of such tremendous and vital importance, not only to the people of this city, but to the people of the world.

The matter that we are to discuss is the question of what means we and other people can devise to gain and secure world peace.

Shall the method be through the United Nations, with a modified charter, or is there some other and better way?

The committee may wonder why the mayor of the city, the association of commerce, and other organizations, have extended this request for a hearing. This city is a large industrial area, and it is more than ordinarily aware of the atomic and nuclear weapons that have recently been disclosed by the highest authorities of the Nation.

Many of us comprehend now that the cities of the world, not only the cities of the United States, will be destroyed as the very first target in the unprecedented and indescribable holocaust that will result from the third world war.

Not only will the cities be reduced, but the people in them also, and that means you and I will be destroyed.

We now know that a range of hydrogen weapons can be devised to wipe out any concentration of people from 5,000 in number upward.

It has been said that the threat of hanging produces a wonderful concentration of the mind. The threat of destruction in atomic warfare should set every person living in a target area to concentrate first and foremost on the overriding problem of how to secure the world peace.

Every official in local government, every mayor, must now become interested in world affairs, for all the plans of local government to improve schools, to build streets, to add subdivisions, and to attract industry, and construct institutions of art and learning and mercy, all these plans can be brought to naught in a sudden and disastrous chain of events.

The subcommittee, no doubt, knows the background of this area. The Middle West is populated by immigrants and children of immigrants who fled their native countries to get away from the military systems that too often prevailed in those countries. There is a strong tradition of what has been termed "isolationism" throughout this region, isolationism that is now expressed by a desire to draw up the borders of the United States around us, and to have as few dealings with others as possible, and to avoid any entanglements in foreign affairs.

This policy, it is thought by many people, will avoid war. However, with the arrival of the age of fast air travel, it is quite apparent that this kind of policy no longer makes sense, with a growing dependence of the United States on critical supplies which must be found elsewhere, and further, with the fact that the United States manufacturers machinery, and these manufacturers of machinery are profoundly upsetting the old and established way of the life of other peoples.

WORLD RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

We must now stand up to our responsibilities in dealing with world matters. There is a feeling expressed in many parts of the United States that participation in a world council of nations, such as the League of Nations, or a similar organization, will increase the chances of our participation in conflict such as the Korean conflict.

Now, I am one of those who think that such world councils are now about the only method left for reducing the chances of war. I shudder to think of what our Nation would not be doing if we did not have such a council presently in existence. Certainly it would be impossible for us, or any other municipal official, to have any other

policy than that of breaking up our cities, scattering industry and commerce on such a basis. I know full well that the whole matter of world peace does not, of course, rest with us alone. Two other nations, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, possess knowledge of the atom bomb, and knowledge of biological and chemical warfare.

Their people also have great responsibilities, as to their leaders, particularly the leaders of the Soviet Union, in my opinion, must answer the question as to whether or not they can make a system of government work without resorting to the constant pressure of the fear of war as a stimulus to production on the part of their people.

It is apparent that they have found no moral equivalent for war in making their system work, but the people themselves in such countries will get weary of the threat of imminent destruction, and I hope they will ultimately force their leaders to sit down and talk straightforwardly on world matters.

We should then be ready with soundly conceived and sensible plans to meet them.

This hearing, particularly in the great State of Wisconsin, can be an important one for developing a plan leading to world peace. We, in Wisconsin, of course, are particularly proud that the Senator from our State is the head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I am sure that he will also be proud to demonstrate to his colleagues who are here today that there is much deep and profound thinking on this subject of how to secure the world peace.

Welcome, gentlemen! [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and thank you, Mr. Witt-huhn.

I might say to my colleagues: You can see the character of public officials that we produce in Wisconsin, which has made Wisconsin one of the cleanest States in this country. There is practically no corruption, there has never been any in our politics, whether they were Progressive Democrats or Republicans.

INTRODUCTION OF WITNESSES

Now, I finally will ask that the witnesses who have asked to be heard come forward to identify themselves briefly.

Just cite your name, and your organization, if you are representing a group, or your occupation, if you are simply speaking for yourself.

Mrs. CLOUGH. I am Mrs. Ernest T. Clough, president of the Milwaukee League of Women Voters.

Mr. ROSELIEP. Gordon W. Roseliep, representing the American Legion, as Wisconsin State commander.

Reverend REECE. Rev. Ralph Reece, president, Wisconsin United Nations Association, affiliated with the American Association for United Nations.

Mr. BETZ. Frank E. Betz, department commander, Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. ZAWACKI. Edmund Zawacki, professor at the University of Wisconsin. I speak for myself as a concerned citizen.

Mr. REUSS. Henry S. Reuss, Milwaukee County Democratic Party.

Mr. EISENDRATH. Jack N. Eisendrath, Milwaukee Peace Education Committee.

Mr. SERAPHIM. Christ T. Seraphim, lawyer, and I speak for myself. The CHAIRMAN. Yes; and you generally do a good job.

Mr. SERAPHIM. Thank you, senator.

Mr. LANPHER. Charles Lanphier, president, Student Federalist Club.

Mr. MATZKE. Walter Matzke. I teach mathematics at the Wauwatosa Senior High School. I will talk for myself.

Mrs. McCLORE. Mrs. Charles McClure; and I speak for myself. I am from Appleton, Wis.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am James P. Buchanan, corporate assistant treasurer, speaking for myself.

Mr. NELSON. Edwin J. Nelson, American Veterans World War II, Wisconsin.

Mr. LUSHBOUGH. L. E. Lushbough, representing a study group of the YMCA, from Oconomowoc.

Mr. MURPHY. Dennis Murphy, of the Milwaukee County Federation High School Young Republicans.

Mr. BOUSCAREN. Dr. Anthony Bouscaren, chairman, department of political science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, also representing World Affairs Institute.

Mr. GOODMAN. Arnold Goodman, representing the Wisconsin branch, United World Federalists.

Mr. GIESE. Lawrence F. Giese, chairman, Wisconsin Committee on United Nations Charter Review.

Mr. SMITH. Harvard C. Smith, instructor, Mary D. Bradford High School, Kenosha, Wis., speaking for myself.

Mr. VEST. Robert G. Vest, Wesley Foundation, Kenwood branch, affiliated with the Methodist Church.

Mr. TREUTEL. I am Maj. Alfred A. Treutel, representing the National Sojourners, Inc., and Military Order of World Wars.

Mr. MORRIS. I am Dr. Rudolph F. Morris, of the department of sociology, Marquette University, speaking for myself.

Mr. SALOMON. Chester V. Salomon, businessman.

Mr. PERRIGO. Burton Perrigo, lawyer, appearing for the American Citizens' League, and as chairman of the Waukesha County Republican Statutory Committee.

Mr. NEUBAUER. E. Ted Neubauer, mechanical engineer, La Crosse, Wis., and I hope to speak as a private citizen.

Mr. DiVILIO. Frank DiVilio, chairman of the Twelfth Ward Regular Republican Club, and past president of the Fourth Division Association.

Mr. MULLIGAN. I am William J. Mulligan, student at Marquette University High School, speaking in my own behalf.

Mr. LaPLANTE. I am Edward LaPlante, representing myself and the American Indians.

Mrs. OLSON. Mrs. Hobart Olson, housewife, and I speak for myself.

Reverend PETERSON. Rev. Erling Peterson, Kenosha, representing the Wisconsin Council of Churches.

Mrs. JONES. Mrs. Henry Jones, State chairman, national defense, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. MORGAN. William J. Morgan, speaking for myself, and for the Wisconsin G. O. P. Clubs, Inc., in the 18th Ward unit of the Republican Party, of Milwaukee. How are you, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Good to see you, Bill.

Mr. FRITCHLER. I am John Fritchler, Jr., attorney at law, speaking for myself.

Mrs. ROMANIK. Mrs. Carl Romanik, president, Business and Professional Women's Club of Milwaukee.

Mr. IHRIG. I am William Ihrig, attorney of Milwaukee, speaking for myself.

Mr. ENGELKE. Walter Engelke, school principal, Madison, Wis., speaking for myself.

Mr. KORB. Thomas W. Korb, attorney and businessman. I speak for myself.

How do you do, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. Glad to see you.

Mr. PFANKUCHEN. Llewelyn Pfankuchen, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, speaking as a citizen.

Mrs. BERNSTEIN. Mrs. E. Ace Bernstein, vice president of Milwaukee section, National Council of Jewish Women.

Mr. KAUB. Verne P. Kaub, president, American Council of Christian Laymen, but appearing as an individual.

Mr. GRUENDER. Charles Gruender, representing the Wisconsin and Milwaukee County CIO.

Mr. WEIGT. I am V. J. Weigt, the unofficial representative of about a dozen Americans, and the official representative of the Advent Christian Church of Baraboo, Wis.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time, we are going to call our first witness, Mrs. Ernest T. Clough, president of the Milwaukee League of Women Voters, who will carry on.

Let me make this general suggestion to all of you. As you can see, time is of the essence. It has been suggested by one of my fellow Senators that we also would like to get suggestions on how to improve the procedure.

You may carry on, Mrs. Clough.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ERNEST T. CLOUGH, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. CLOUGH. Thank you, Senator. First of all, I would like to express my great appreciation for the opportunity to be here this morning. I think that this is one of the most important things which is being done at the moment in the country, and I feel that we should congratulate you and your subcommittees in showing leadership in a field where it is very badly needed, that is, keeping close to the American people and I do want to thank you again for the opportunity.

I think I shall have to ask to be allowed to put my glasses on.

SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The League of Women Voters has supported the United Nations since its inception and continues to do so today as the cornerstone of United States foreign policy. The league has always had an interest in international cooperation. As early as 1923, it proclaimed its belief that "isolation is neither possible nor desirable for the United States." Actually, isolation from world politics was only a temporary and passing phase of American history during part of the nineteenth century. Despite popular opinion to the contrary, our

new Nation did not begin its existence with a clean slate so far as world involvement was concerned. In fact, the colonies had taken a very active part in an international contest which is gradually becoming recognized as "perhaps the most momentous event in the life of the English speaking people in the New World"; that is, the crucial struggle between Great Britain and France for possession of the New World. We learned in school to call this struggle the French and Indian wars, but in recent years it is being much more significantly indicated as the great war for the empire. The American Revolution was a direct aftermath of this struggle. Our new Nation had hardly drawn its first breath when it found itself in the War of 1812. So, from the beginning, you see, our American history has largely evolved in a world setting.

During the 30 years of its history, the League of Women Voters has accepted the fact of the interdependence of the world. It is also fully aware of the interrelationship of domestic and international factors and carries out its programs within that framework. It has a long history of interest in collective security and has always known that United States participation is essential to such a system. Today, the United States position as a major world power carries with it not only the inescapable responsibility for exercising world leadership but also the opportunity to contribute to the successful functioning of an organization devoted to international cooperation.

SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

On the basis of its consistent and firm belief in the principles of international cooperation, the league supported United States membership in the United Nations when the charter was before the Senate for approval in July 1945. Since that time, support of the United Nations has been an important part of league activity. The league's support of the United Nations does not necessarily imply an unqualified endorsement of all of its policies or programs, but it is a recognition of the United Nations as a necessary mechanism for settling international differences. Nor is the league unaware of the fact that the United Nations has not fulfilled all the expectations and hopes of its founders. But the fact remains that the United Nations does have an impressive record of achievements which have contributed to the solution of some of the basic—notice what I say—social, economic, and political problems of the world. They have been enumerated far too often to require repetition at this time. However, one of them, Korea, deserves particular mention; for here, for the first time in history, aggression was turned back by the force of collective security.

The league has supported legislation in support of the United States membership in the United Nations and in a number of the specialized agencies that related to areas of league concern; in support of United States appropriations for United Nations contributions; in support of technical assistance programs of the United Nations; in support of the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy; and in support of moves to strengthen the United Nations, such as the Vandenberg resolution, the uniting for peace resolution, and NATO and other collective-security arrangements with emphasis on the necessity of establishing these collective-security arrangements within the framework of the United Nations.

UNDERSTANDING THE UNITED NATIONS

Besides this legislative support, the league has also undertaken a sustained and intensive program of public education concerning the United Nations, as it believes that citizen understanding is essential to the support and thus the success of this organization. I believe that this understanding should include a realistic conception of the world in which the United Nations must operate and function and an ability to distinguish between the desirable and the possible. Like our United States Constitution, the charter of the United Nations is proving to be a flexible document within whose framework several developments have already occurred. One is the increasing use of the General Assembly. Another is the present practice that abstention from voting by a permanent member of the Security Council does not constitute a veto. These changes have been possible only because they were acceptable to more than two-thirds of the member nations. That is to say, it is obvious that the United Nations works satisfactorily only when willingness exists. The United Nations is the reflection of the world and the responsibility of its members is the key to its success. The written word exercises a potent fascination and all too often we see evil, compose the perfect formula for its solution, and then consider the matter accomplished. A document can be the result only of preexisting will of its framers, if it is to be successfully implemented. The world needs an accepted medium through which the relations of nations may be conducted in peace. Time is not unlimited. Since the United Nations Charter is the fruit of man's best efforts so far toward the goal of international cooperation, let us not, in the words of John Foster Dulles, "lose the good that is, in the search for something better."

Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We certainly appreciate that statement.

We will carry on now, and we will ask Mr. Gordon Roseliep, State commander of the American Legion to give us his ideas.

STATEMENT OF GORDON W. ROSELIEP, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. ROSELIEP. Honorable Senator Wiley, I am Gordon W. Roseliep, department commander of the American Legion.

This is taken from the summary of proceedings of the 35th Annual Convention of the American Legion, August 31 through September 3, 1953, at St. Louis, Mo.:

LEGION ATTITUDE TOWARD THE U. N.

No. 1. United Nations: The American people have suffered keen disappointment and tragic disillusionment at the failure of the United Nations to achieve and maintain world peace; that there is weakness in the existing structure of the United Nations, and that very substantial amendments in 1955 are desirable is clear.

Because of the conduct of the Soviet Union and her satellites, the United Nations as it is presently constituted and operating is ineffective as an instrument for world peace, which we believe to be its primary objective since its beginning. Until fundamental changes are made in the United Nations Charter and in the operation and conduct of the United Nations, we must rely for our security upon our own strength and the cooperation of other free nations.

Yet, so long as world war III has been averted and continues to be averted, there is a basis for hope that the United Nations can be made to justify its existence.

It must be remembered that we are engaged in a death struggle with a ruthless enemy, and the United Nations heads up the free countries in this conflict.

As disappointing as some of the accomplishments and failures of the United Nations have been to us, the fact remains that in some sectors it has achieved its success, and it is the only remaining form that enables us to maintain contact with the enemy and to ferret out his schemes and devices, and furnishes us with an average with which we can meet and counter his wicked schemes.

SUGGESTED CHARTER CHANGES

It is for this reason that we urge at this time the continued support of the United Nations. The Charter of the United Nations provides for a General Congress in the year 1955. The American Legion firmly believes that this charter should be amended to meet the needs and requirements to correct the inadequacies that have become apparent since its original drafting at San Francisco in 1945.

Once again we reinstate the plan to strengthen the United Nations by limitation of the use of veto in matters of aggression; international control of scientific weapons; and establishment of an effective United Nations armed force; and a rededication of the United Nations to the basic purpose for which it was founded, to maintain peace throughout the world.

We believe that by proper amendments to its charter the weaknesses and inefficiencies of its structure can and will be corrected.

We further believe that some of the numerous collateral agencies in the United Nations not germane to collective security, or the welfare of the member nations, can be eliminated or reoriented.

In furtherance of the above, your committee makes the following specific recommendations:

That the National Executive Committee direct its Commission on Foreign Relations (a) to consider and report on all previously recommended amendments to the United Nations Charter; to consider and recommend additional amendments made necessary by recent events; to have its Subcommittee on Human Rights, and other agencies, continue its study on UNESCO, and other independent agencies in the United Nations.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON OTHER SUBJECTS

No. 2, treaties, pacts and agreements: We reaffirm our conviction that there is need for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will assure that treaties, pacts, and agreements made on behalf of the United States shall not become operative as international law in the United States, without specific legislation by the Congress.

It is our considered judgment that Senate rules should be changed to provide that at least a two-thirds majority of a quorum of the Senate shall approve treaties. We definitely oppose any modification or waiver of treaty terms by the executive branch of the Government, without the consent of this Senate.

No. 3, we urge that the Congress keep a constant check on recently passed NATO agreements to insure continued maintenance of our Armed Forces personnel serving in NATO countries who are charged with offenses against civil law.

No. 4, we reinstate our vigorous opposition to the participation of the United States in any form of government or federation.

God bless America. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Gordon Roseliep.

I am sure that the suggestions that you have made in relation to the United Nations Charter will be given due consideration.

As to the collateral suggestions, we have no jurisdiction at this time over them.

What we want are definite suggestions as contained in that speech. We think that those things are very helpful, so I say thank you.

At this time we have the Rev. Ralph Reece, president of the Wisconsin United Nations Association.

Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF REV. RALPH REECE, MENOMONIE, WIS.

Reverend REECE. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

Senator Wiley and members of your committee, I am very happy to have the privilege of appearing before this fine group of men this morning, and I want to express myself in regard to what has been achieved by the United Nations, and to say that personally I do not think it has been a failure at all.

There are many things about the United Nations that, of course, will have to be changed as time goes on, but for us to have created the kind of charter that we have out of the kind of conflict from which we emerged, in the short notice that we had, is certainly testimony of the fact that we can find a way to eternal peace upon this earth by mutual agreement by peoples across the earth.

And for that reason I am happy to report to you that the Wisconsin United Nations Association believes in this fine organization; that we also believe that it should be strengthened so that we can carry out the provisions that we read in the United Nations Charter.

GOOD WILL OF PEOPLE NEEDED

Now, we know that there are some things that will have to be done. It isn't easy to make all of these suggestions, and be sure that they are going to work out perfectly, but we do know this—regardless of how good a charter we might have, that unless there is sincerity of purpose on the part of all the people who signed that charter, regardless of how good it might be, that charter will be absolutely worthless.

THE CHAIRMAN. If I understand you rightly, you think that while the mechanism is important, the folks who drive it are the significant factors?

Reverend REECE. I feel that way about it very strongly, sir, and we know that unless we have the people behind this thing that it will not work.

BROADER INTERPRETATION OF CHARTER PROVISIONS

Then in the second place there is another thing that can be done, I think, to strengthen the charter, and our organization feels that way, too. We feel that there should be some growth in the organization, that is, there should be a rather liberal interpretation of the charter itself, so that we can add such bodies to this charter as become necessary, as time goes on, because we know that is going to happen, and if we follow through with that kind of procedure it seems to me that it may not be absolutely necessary that we have a revision at this time.

We do know that revision will have to come as we move along.

In the third place, it seems to us that when we think of the United Nations, that we can accommodate ourselves to this revision on the basis of the part in the charter that allows this to take place, and I understand that is to take place or should take place in 1955, but it is not mandatory.

Now, I have faith in the leadership of our country, and I have faith in the leadership of the United Nations.

I have not been so terribly frightened about some of the scare stories that I have heard and read. Certainly we ought to be alert, and good Americans are always alert, but we don't have to be frightened into these things.

PERMANENT U. N. COMMITTEE TO STUDY CHARTER CHANGES

It seems to me that if we keep that in mind, and the fact that there is a possibility of revision, that if that becomes necessary, then it is all well and good, but we must remember that if we are thinking in terms of revision, that we should watch and see that the political climate is right for revision.

As we sit here this morning and try to think of what is going on in the world, it seems to me that it would be entirely possible for a very serious thing to happen if we tried to revise the charter in view of what is going on in the world.

Now, I feel that within the United Nations there should be a committee set up, a permanent committee, to study the possibilities of revision, and then probably at some future time present these things and then carry through.

There is another thing about the charter, and about the United Nations: We can never expect it to be what it should, until the citizenry is fully informed of what is going on.

You are to be congratulated, Senator Wiley, for making this a grassroots attempt, because this is what we need, to get down where people live, and if the farmers of Wisconsin, and the dairymen of Wisconsin, and all the laborers and the businessmen, could really understand what the United Nations has attempted to do in preventing trouble around the world, I think they would be more firmly behind it than they are, and the dairymen and farmers should know the many things that are happening as the result of the agricultural association that is working through the United Nations.

I want to thank you, sir, for this opportunity, and I wish you well for what you are attempting to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, sir. Perhaps my associates have some questions.

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Gillette.

Senator GILLETTE. I should like to make one comment, also ask one question:

REVISION OR EVOLUTION

You compared the United Nations Charter to the Constitution of the United States, as did the two preceding witnesses, and suggested that perhaps there would evolve out of the use of the United Nations Charter salutary changes for its improvement.

You must bear in mind, however, that we can amend the Constitution of the United States, and the Supreme Court can change it by interpretation. There is no comparable machinery in the United Nations for interpreting its provisions, and an amendment is subject to veto.

You suggested that perhaps we should delay a conference on revision, and let these other forces have an opportunity to operate, but they cannot operate. Do you see any alternative for an attempt to revise the charter at the Revision Conference that is provided by the terms of the charter itself after 10 years of operation?

Reverend REECE. Well, sir, I would only say this, that the powers that be that prevent a great many things happening in the United Nations today, I believe, would be standing in the way again for any attempts that might be made. I feel that way about it. I don't agree with them, but I am afraid that that has always been their intentions. They have done it again and again and again, and there is no reason for us to think that they are not going to do it this time, if they have an opportunity.

Senator GILLATT. Don't you believe that the work of this subcommittee in getting a cross section of the opinion of the people as to how the charter could be revised, is a very wise procedure, so that we can present a concrete policy backed by our Government at the conference in 1955?

Reverend REECE. I certainly do. The thing I am wondering about is this, however: If this is the right time to do it, then it should be done, but I believe the judgment of our people, who have ability along this line, would know whether or not this is the time to do it.

Certainly I am not standing against—and neither is our organization—the revision of this charter, because we believe that it must grow, it must change, and it must be able to encompass all of the things that are taking place in the world, and those of us who sit here today and have seen many things happen in the last few years that make it necessary for you to look at the charter in that light.

Senator GILLATT. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. There is just one suggestion, I think, that is very important. I think we all realize that the Kremlin, through its representatives, has exercised this veto, that you speak of, and can exercise it in the conference.

I think the real question that we have to think about, assuming that there is no change in the mental attitude of the Kremlin's representatives, is whether we should continue the United Nations. If we don't continue it, what is the alternative? Where do we go from here, if we have no crossroads of the world?

Reverend REECE. Are you asking me that, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Reverend REECE. Well, I can say it in about a four-lettered word, I think Sherman expressed it very beautifully in his phrase. I don't think there is any way out of world conflict unless we have an organization like the United Nations.

I think we must have it. If we didn't have it, we would have to create something like it anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

Next we have Mr. Jack N. Eisendrath, Peace Education Committee.

STATEMENT OF JACK N. EISENDRATH, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. EISENDRATH. Senator Wiley, and honorable members of the committee, and guests, I represent the Milwaukee Peace Education Committee, which is the organization that has sponsored, with the aid of many other leading civic groups, the last two all-day sessions that we held to study this idea of charter revision.

I want to say, perhaps taking up a word or two about your last question to the previous speaker, and certainly we agree with much of what he said, and yet, we would have a difference, so far as time is concerned.

I want to say that we, a responsible group of businessmen, housewives, and professional people, believe also that the United Nations must be continued and must be strengthened.

In your question as to the change of mental attitude, Senator Wiley, it is our feeling that human beings are so built that there is no such thing as a firm, positive, unchanging mental attitude.

NEED FOR CHARTER REVIEW

The events in Korea, where we have reached negotiation time after time, even though it was difficult; the events, perhaps, in Iran, where negotiations had been worked out with the Soviet Union; the events in Greece; the credits due to the United Nations show that there is no time that negotiation was stopped, and we mean negotiation without appeasement, of course, and it is for that reason that we say that the Charter Review Conference should be held in 1955, and we go further to say that the charter must be revised, as has been so well mentioned.

We have had 10 years of history, and we have learned many things in those 10 years. At the time we set up the United Nations, we didn't know much about A-bombs, so we could not provide this type of group of laws, because things have changed with the advent of the atomic bomb.

Furthermore, at that time the conflict between the East and the West did not exist, so we now must have a different set of rules, in view of the fact that there are two litigants who have different ideas about how they should continue.

SPECIFIC CHARTER CHANGES RECOMMENDED

We believe, specifically, that among other changes in the charter, that the following should be put into effect:

We believe that there should be some type of universal disarmament under law.

We believe, secondly, that there should be a compulsory referral of legal disputes when they endanger international peace to the International Court of Justice.

We further believe that there should be a broader use of Social and Economic Council.

We also believe that there should be an elimination of the veto, with respect to the inclusion and admission of new members, and we further believe that the veto should be eliminated with respect to the pacific settlement of disputes.

So far as disarmament is concerned, honorable members of the Senate, I don't think it is necessary to state to anybody in our country the terrific burden of armaments, financially, physically, and spiritually. We cannot continue in the future.

While I am talking, a man could sit on the edge of the Grand Canyon and drop \$114,000 every minute for the next year into that Grand Canyon, and it still would not equal of \$60 billion appropriation of the United States armaments for last year.

IMPORTANCE OF DISARMAMENT

We talk about the security of the H-bomb. It is our contention that there is no security, and never will be so far as armaments are concerned. We found that out with World War I and World War II. We do not mean that there should be unilateral disarmament but we do mean that we cannot talk about one country having more H-bombs than another. What difference does it make if we have 60,000 H-bombs, and the Soviet have only 20,000, if 600 well-placed bombs could level our country, and our own experts have said that we could not stop 50 percent of the planes that come in from the North with these terrifying bombs.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you get the Kremlin to agree to this overall plan?

Mr. EISENDRATH. Oh, I realize, sir, that it is not—

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't that the issue?

Mr. EISENDRATH. Practically, is that the issue?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. EISENDRATH. Yes, the issue in all of our suggestions is how can we get the other side of the fence to agree, but it seems to me that in our own country, in labor disputes, in the working of our Congress in the differences between the two great parties, while we may have much more in common, we have at times in our own history, in the beginnings of our country, in the Civil War, and in many other instances, we have faced the same problem, "How will the other side agree?"

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, your idea is that the United Nations provides practically the only vehicle we have to try to find that solution with the Kremlin, is that it?

ABOLISHMENT OF VETO ON MEMBERSHIP

Mr. EISENDRATH. Yes, Senator Wiley, and that leads me to the next point, and that is universal membership in the abolition of the veto with regard to leaving in some of the members who would like to get in. If we talk about how are we going to get to agree, we cannot leave some of these litigants who need the help of this forum, we cannot leave them out, as we have done in the past. It is true that the Soviets have exercised, perhaps, 98 percent of the 57 or so vetoes that have been used in the past, and the majority, over 40 of them have been used to keep out members that they do not wish into membership.

But we say that this is a world that has become unified; this is a world where we must ask for universal membership. The problems of the world that create war are not only armaments or differences

between the East and the West, but they are differences because people have minds that are in motion, because the world is moving, and because we here sometimes fail to realize that the sources of war are perhaps over in Asia, where two-thirds of the people in the entire world today will go to bed without eating.

The CHAIRMAN. The economic phase of it is tremendous, isn't it? Mr. EISENDRATH. That is right.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Well, if there is a moment more I would like to say, so far as the elimination of the veto in pacific settlement of disputes, and one important thing, I think, so far as referral to specific settlement of disputes, I think the charter is so written today that it is not obligatory so far as the pacific settlement of disputes is concerned.

Under article 38 the Security Council may—

at any stage of a dispute [the continuance of which is likely to endanger international peace] recommend appropriate procedures.

Now, that wording is permissive and suggestive only, and we feel in order to settle some of these ideas, they must be referred to this international court that we have set up, but it must not be, "do you want to go or do you not want to go."

This is a dispute that endangers the entire world. This is the forum before which it must be taken, and we further would like to suggest that any litigant to a dispute, just as in our own civil courts, may have the opportunity to take his dispute, if he so wishes, to that international court of justice, and should not have to wait until the Security Council makes a suggestion.

The elimination of the veto, so far as pacific settlement of disputes, we feel, is also necessary to have one side or the other say, "Well, we don't think this should be referred for settlement to a court," because it seems to me that it stymies that problem so far as settlement is concerned, and the veto must be taken away here as well as in the admission of new members.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

(The prepared statement of Mr. Eisendrath is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF JACK N. EISENDRATH ON BEHALF OF THE MILWAUKEE PEACE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

My name is Jack Eisendrath. I am an attorney in Milwaukee. I am appearing as a member and on behalf of the Milwaukee Peace Education Committee which is a responsible group of businessmen, housewives, and professional people. The Peace Education Committee was organized with the assistance of the American Friends Service Committee about 2 years ago after a series of study groups based on the Quaker brochure known as Steps to Peace and the Quaker film A Time for Greatness. It was the Milwaukee Peace Education Committee that, in conjunction with many of Milwaukee's leading civic groups, sponsored two all-day seminars on U. N. Charter revision in Milwaukee January 10 and April 3 of this year. The Peace Education Committee is not a partisan pleader for any group or party. We believe that all other concerns are insignificant compared with the problem of maintaining peace in the world.

One cannot discuss peace without reference to the U. N., which President Eisenhower has called man's greatest hope for peace. Imperfection is the mark of human achievements; thus, is the United Nations subject to the weaknesses and failures that ever serve as an impetus for man's wish to improve his handiwork.

Our basic issue today is not how to strengthen the U. N., but how to strengthen the U. N. faced with the differences between the East and West. Any discussion of U. N. Charter revision would be naive if it failed to acknowledge the incessant striving of the United States to strengthen the U. N. and the practical difficulty of easily reaching a common ground with Soviet thinking. That is the reality of the situation. On the other hand, it is also folly to fail to appreciate fully that public opinion everywhere demands a strong forthright leadership from the United States—leadership that will leave no stone unturned to negotiate without appeasement, and grasp the opportunity of achieving peace in our time.

DISARMAMENT

What are some of the possible changes in the charter that are needed today in the light of our 9 years of experience with the U. N.?

We know that today there is no advantage for one country because it may have more atom bombs than another. What difference does it make if one nation has 10,000 and another 12,000 atom bombs if 100 well-placed bombs could level a country. Where is this thing we call sovereignty to declare war when any country may call the signals that will force us to go to war. In order to have peace, I gave up my sovereign right to declare war on my next-door neighbor when I moved into this city—and everybody else did the same. There is no freedom in our right to enter an atomic war. Freedom should be exercised while there is still time to enter into some type of international control of armaments. Where is our freedom if 80 to 90 cents out of each dollar the United States spends goes for a peacetime defense budget. The whole U. N. budget for a year is equal to the amount it costs to clean the streets of New York City. One could sit on the edge of the Grand Canyon and drop in \$100,000 every minute for a whole year and it still wouldn't equal our \$90 billion defense appropriation of last year. Curiously enough, the greater our defense preparation the more powerful our H-bomb; instead of more security as one would imagine, we have become more jittery and insecure.

The U. N. Charter must be implemented with some type of enforceable universal disarmament. Conventional and atomic weapons of destruction must be outlawed and provision must be made for adequate reduction, inspection and control.

We are echoing the hollow mockery of words alone if we say that the H-bomb will secure peace. Peace has never been secured through war as we have seen in World War I and II. At one time we thought the answer was the Hiroshima A-bomb with its strength of 20,000 tons of TNT; today we say it is the H-bomb with its equivalent of 12 million tons of TNT. Does Russia have less or more H-bombs than we do. If less, will she not hasten so that tomorrow she will have more, and the next day we must increase our stockpiles. What difference does it make if we do have more H-bombs when our own Air Force experts say we could not stop even 50 percent of the enemy planes loaded with bombs coming in from the north. Peace by war is an anachronism. With the development of each more terrifying bomb we have become more frightened animals desperately trying to think of where to look for cover when the storm breaks. Peace through war is wishful thinking—and always has been. Peace is secured by careful study, negotiation, conciliation, and force of international law. International tensions and conflicts of ideas are difficult to resolve in the midst of many bombs and bombers.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we state that we favor implementation of the principles of disarmament as set forth in Senate resolution 150 of July 29, 1953, as printed on page 185 of your subcommittee's document 87.

The U. N. Charter must be revised to provide for the inclusion of international law that will guaranty enforceable disarmament. Treaties, conferences, agreements, are not enough; there must be binding legislation and an adequate enforcing agency. At no time in the history of any country has peace existed through any other means than enforceable law.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

The Peace Education Committee further believes that membership in the U. N. should be universal. If this is one world all of its parts should have a place to meet and discuss their disputes under established rules of conduct. Peaceful settlement of disputes cannot be accomplished practically if a large number of nations is excluded from membership. Thus far, 14 nations have been barred from entrance because of the East-West conflict. All countries should be ad-

mitted who are willing to accept the responsibility of membership and the veto should be eliminated in admission of new members. Many diplomats in the U. N. have also expressed their agreement with this idea.

We cannot expect to achieve peace and ignore problems which cause war. The nations to whom we refuse membership have vital concerns which seriously affect the world's social and political life. The minds of men are in motion throughout the earth. Man no longer believes things have to be as they were. Today is the historical moment for change. Even if we were not deallocked with the Soviets we would have to recognize that these new ideas and longings of men throughout the world for security and recognition are contagious, and we cannot hide our heads calmly in the sand and say things are as they were. Through Korea and Indochina we have learned that when sparks fly in any part of the world there is a danger of fire spreading all over. Consequently, we must be willing to concern ourselves with the sources of conflict in other parts of the world and permit all countries to bring their problems to a world forum. There was a time when we could refuse to recognize that, according to figures of the World Health Organization, two-thirds of the world will go to bed tonight ill-fed and undernourished. Incidentally, it was to this World Health Organization that our contribution in 1953 was only \$1 million while for each heavy bomber we spent \$5½ million. World Health Organization also tells us that malaria has 300 million victims a year, that trachoma covers four-fifths of the globe, that although the span of life is 70 in the Netherlands, in Asia 1 out of 5 dies before the first year of life.

We must not make our neighbors strangers and refuse to admit all peoples to meet in the same room to air their wants and yearnings. We must recognize the world in movement as it evidences itself in the stirrings in Indonesia, Indochina, India, Africa, China, Pakistan, Malaya, and Morocco.

For such reasons we say the veto must be abolished as to admission of new members so that 1 world may not become 2 because we close the door to inquiring eyes and hearts and minds. The Vandenberg Senate Resolution 239 of June 1948 called for removal of the veto on admission of new members. In November of 1949, the General Assembly of the U. N. passed a resolution requesting members of the Security Council not to use the veto to bar admission of new members.

ELIMINATION OF VETO IN PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

The Milwaukee Peace Education Committee further believes that the veto should be eliminated from questions involving pacific settlement of disputes. This need was recognized back as far as 1948, when the Senate Vandenberg resolution called for removal of the veto in such instance. The Soviet Union has used the veto at least nine times in connection with pacific settlements. Many delegates at San Francisco were never in favor of the veto in pacific settlement of disputes. To secure peace requires the removal of stumbling blocks to negotiations. Each time a veto is raised it creates such heated argument over the use of the veto that the major issue is obscured and neglected. We therefore would hope for a change in the charter especially as stated in staff study No. 1 of this subcommittee, the United States is already on record as favoring removal of the veto from pacific settlement of disputes.

COMPULSORY REFERRAL OF LEGAL DISPUTES TO INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

We would also recommend a change in article 36 of the charter which refers to procedures in the Security Council for settlement of disputes. At present the wording is permissive and suggestive only where referral to the International Court of Justice is considered. Such weak language does not bolster the peace-making powers of the U. N. We believe it would be of great value to make referral to the International Court of Justice obligatory in every case where legal disputes are of a serious character as to endanger peace. Provision should also be made for individual nations to have the right to initiate International Court of Justice proceedings just as individuals in civil life may turn to the courts for help.

STRENGTHENING OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Finally, we would broaden the use of the Economic and Social Council. Peace is not the absence of war; peace is an all-pervading environment that recognizes that all men are equal in God's eyes. Peace calls for a continuous and abiding belief in the dignity of man—all men—whether it be the African farmer in a still

house over the Niger River, the Indian plainsman on the banks of the Indus, or the Mississippi sharecropper near the Yazoo River.

The advocate who talks about our heritage of freedom must act as if he believes in freedom for all. The U. N. cannot foster peace and freedom while constant gnawing hunger and disease rides rampant in Asia and other parts of the world. These vital needs must be attacked on an international basis of joint action without interfering in affairs essentially within the jurisdiction of a state. For this purpose, as the Economic and Social Council recommended in August 1953, the savings of disarmament should be used for aid in underdeveloped countries. We would go further and state that voluntary contributions for economic and social aid are not enough. Eventually a system of direct levy or limited taxation on each member state must be developed so that adequate funds will be available for social and economic reconstruction.

The world looks to the United States for moral and spiritual leadership in troubled times. We cannot assume leadership unless we vote to strengthen the U. N. as the greatest force for peace. We join with thousands of others who ask that the United States not hold to favor a charter review conference and then move with courage and foresight to strengthen the charter.

Perhaps the mature and intelligent approach to the U. N. is well expressed in the concluding paragraph of a recently published booklet:

"The United Nations is manmade, and man can produce no miracles. The United Nations has not brought peace to the world. The United Nations has not brought food to all the hungry, relief to all the ill, freedom to all the oppressed, shelter to all the wanderers. But the least—and the most—that can be said for it is that the United Nations is man's attempt to do exactly these things. There is no guaranty of success. But each nation—and each person—must make the choice between living in the jungle or attempting to clear it."

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Dr. Anthony Bouscaren, political science department, Marquette University, and also representing the World Affairs Institute.

STATEMENT OF DR. ANTHONY BOUSCAREN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. BOUSCAREN. Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the committee, I want to comment briefly on the statements made by the representative from the Peace Education Committee.

I think sometimes in our anxiety to have peace we overlook the fact that in the final analysis, liberty—the liberty of our country, and our individual liberties, are more important than peace. We can have peace at any price, as Neville Chamberlain did at Munich. We can have peace today by getting out of Korea and giving the enemy Formosa, and recognizing Red China, bringing Red China into the United Nations.

We all want peace desperately, but we don't want peace at any price.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not guarantee peace either. What would be their next demand?

Mr. BOUSCAREN. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that we strengthen the provisions for collective security in the United Nations Charter, particularly those in chapter 7, recognizing that not through our decisions, but through the decision of the Soviet Government peaceful coexistence in the long run is impossible. The Soviet leaders reiterate this time and time again, and the experiences in Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, and Korea, indicate that the Soviet Government is committed to expansion and that to try to talk them out of expansion at the conference table is going to have about the same success as trying to talk Hitler out of expansion at Munich would have had.

My primary interest in making these suggestions for charter revision is to make the United Nations an effective force for collective security against aggression.

LESSONS OF THE KOREAN WAR

The experience in the Korean war indicated that collective security was undertaken primarily by the United States and the Republic of Korea, the latter not a United Nations member.

The experience of the Korean war also indicated that certain United Nations members were able to aid aggression, either directly or indirectly, thus encouraging the slaughter of American boys. This indirect violation of article 2, sections 4, 5 and 6; article 6; article 25; article 43; article 48; and article 49—all of these articles calling for support of United Nations collective security actions, and for expulsion from the United Nations (article 6) of United Nations members violating this principle.

Finally, the Korean war indicated that a nonmember state, labeled as an aggressor, could remain immune from the sanctions provided for in article 42—the heart of the United Nations Charter—and even be seriously considered for United Nations membership while still involved in aggression.

Thus, the following proposals are presented with a view to introducing an element of responsibility for all United Nations members to assist United Nations collective security measures, and to provide effective sanctions for United Nations members not so cooperating, and for nonmembers who may cherish hopes of gaining admittance while still engaged in aggression.

Additionally, there are proposals to restrict the use of the veto power by any state who has abused it in the past, and to prevent the veto from being used to prevent peace-loving states from being admitted to the United Nations. Now, specifically, I would suggest the following changes:

EXPULSION AND EXCLUSION OF AGGRESSOR STATES

I would add to article 2 a section 8:

The United Nations shall expel from its membership any member labeled as an aggressor by the General Assembly, and shall exclude from membership any nonmember state which has been or shall be so labeled.

This, of course, would apply to Red China.

I would also add a section 9 to article 2, which would read:

United Nations members giving economic and other nonmilitary aid to states labeled as aggressors by the General Assembly shall immediately have their membership status reviewed by the General Assembly. U. N. members giving military aid to aggressors so labeled shall be expelled from the United Nations in accordance with article 6 of the charter.

Now this is, of course, to introduce an element of responsibility, to make all United Nations members actually live up to the charter, so that the United Nations would not degenerate into a debating club like the League of Nations did.

Article 4 talks about peace-loving states. I think we should recognize that we cannot apply this term to all existing members of the United Nations, so I think we should delete the word "other" in reference to talking about new members.

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest because of the time that these very fine suggestions be incorporated in the record? How many have you here?

Mr. BOURCAREN. Mr. Chairman, I have just two more suggestions that I would like to make, if I could select them, if that would be all right, sir, and then I can conclude my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BOURCAREN. I think that the veto should not be applied to new members. I think, too, that article 27, section 3, should be modified as follows:

LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF VETOES

Abuse of the veto power by a permanent members of the Security Council, to the extent of 50 or more vetoes in the period prior to 1955, shall result in a restriction of its use by that member to this extent: Such a member shall not use the veto further until all other permanent members of the Security Council shall have used it a combined total equal to that used by the abusing member.

[Applause.]

Now, it is my hope here that we can stop the abuse of the Soviet veto, and we can put the other permanent members of the Security Council on more of a basis of equality with the abusing member.

Now, finally, I would add a new article 52 to the charter:

EXPULSION OF STATES AIDING AGGRESSORS

A United Nations member resisting the application of article 42, or seeking to frustrate its intention, by aiding aggression, shall be expelled from the United Nations in accordance with article 6. Nonmembers so acting shall be automatically excluded from membership.

This, of course, would have relevance to our experience in the Korean war, and possible further experiences in Indochina, to see to it that the Soviet Union or the United Nations members who aid aggression openly and flagrantly plan it, should not be able to sit in with a group that is termed "peace-loving," which is supposed to maintain world peace.

Also to make it certain that Communist China and other non-members, who repeatedly violate the United Nations Charter, to make certain that they shall never be invited into the United Nations organization.

That is my summary, Mr. Chairman. I am particularly anxious that the United Nations become an effective force for collective security. I think up to the present time it has not been much more successful than the League was.

Let's learn by the lessons of history, Munich, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and let's put teeth into the United Nations Charter so that aggressors will feel those teeth, and we will have some opportunity to punish aggression and maintain world peace really in an effective manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have none.

Senator GILLETTE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, and all of these suggestions will certainly receive consideration by the committee.

What we like about them is that they are concrete. You have made clear what you think should be done.

Mr. BOURCAREN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And we thank you.

(The full text of the statement prepared by Mr. Bouscaron is as follows:)

SPECIFIC CHARTER REVISION SUGGESTIONS, TOGETHER WITH REASONS THEREFOR

Add to article 2 a section 8: "The United Nations shall expel from its membership any member labeled as an aggressor by the General Assembly, and shall exclude from membership any nonmember state which has been or shall be so labeled."

Add to article 2 a section 9: "United Nations members giving economic and other nonmilitary aid to states labeled as aggressors by the General Assembly shall immediately have their membership status reviewed by the General Assembly. U. N. members giving military aid to aggressors so labeled shall be expelled from the U. N. in accordance with article 6 of the charter."

Reason: See introduction.

Article 4, section 1: Delete the word "other" before the term "peace-loving states" inasmuch as this term cannot with good conscience be applied to all existing U. N. members.

Article 4, section 2: Delete "upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Reason: To prevent further use of the veto against new members.

Article 5: Insert a period after the word "Assembly", and delete "upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council."

Reason: To recognize that a permanent member of the Security Council could be so suspended, and to insure that such a member not use the veto.

Article 6: Line 3, replace the word "may" to "shall", and delete "upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Reason: To make more effective this most important and hitherto overlooked provision of the charter, and to insure its use when necessary even against a permanent member of the Security Council.

Article 8: Delete this article.

Reason: To assist member states, and particularly the host to the U. N. to protect themselves and peace-loving states against individuals engaged in subversion.

Article 10: Delete "except as provided in article 12."

Reason: To prevent veto in Security Council from holding up General Assembly consideration.

Article 11: Delete "except as provided in article 12."

Reason: Same as above.

Article 12: Delete this article.

Reason: Same as above.

Article 14: Delete "subject to the provisions of article 12."

Reason: Same as above.

Article 23: Following the enumeration of the permanent members of the Security Council, insert the following: "subject to sections 8 and 9, article 2."

Reason: To make it clear that permanent members of the Security Council may be guilty of violating the charter, thus causing sanctions to be applied against them, just like any other member or nonmember.

Article 27, section 3: Add the following: "Abuse of the veto power by a permanent member of the Security Council, to the extent of 50 or more vetoes in the period prior to 1955, shall result in a restriction of its use by that member to this extent: Such a member shall not use the veto further until all other permanent members of the Security Council shall have used it a combined total equal to that used by the abusing member."

Reason: To prevent further abuse of the veto power.

Article 35: Rephrase the end of section 3 to read: "of article 11."

Reason: Previous deletion of article 12.

Article 41: Change the word "may" as used the first two times to the word "shall."

Reason: To make it more certain that sanctions shall be enacted.

Article 42: Replace the first word "may" with the word "shall."

Reason: Same as above.

Articles 46 and 47: Delete these articles.

Reason: They have proven to be dead letters thus far.

Article 48: Delete "or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine."

Reason: To prevent exceptions to the rule.

Add new article 52: "A United Nations member resisting the application of article 42, or seeking to frustrate its intention, by aiding aggression, shall be expelled from the U. N. in accordance with article 6. Nonmembers so acting shall be automatically excluded from membership."

Reason: See Introduction.

Article 53: Delete everything after the first sentence in section 1. Delete also entire section 2.

Reason: To make more effective regional arrangements, and to eliminate clauses which have become obsolete.

Article 100: Delete this article.

Reason: Same as reason for deleting article 8.

Articles 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107: Delete these articles.

Reasons: To make more effective existing collective security agreements; to avoid giving a cloak to subversion on the territory of the host state; to eliminate obsolete provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Frank E. Betz, of Milwaukee, Milwaukee commander of the Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars.

STATEMENT OF FRANK E. BETZ, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. Betz. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, today I am expressing the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the department of Wisconsin, which opinion is the same as the opinion of 1¼ million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. [Applause.]

ATTITUDE ON CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

The Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes any influence whatever which would tend to weaken our national security. In this connection, the Veterans of Foreign Wars in recent national conventions has adopted resolutions: (1) Opposing and reaffirming its opposition of the establishment of a world government or other type of supergovernment. [Applause.]

(2) Opposing the proposed genocide treaty.

(3) Supporting a constitutional amendment to regulate the making of treaties and executive agreements. [Applause.]

(4) Supporting the McCarran-Walter Act. [Applause.]

And (5) opposing the distribution of UNESCO pamphlets to our schools and libraries to be used by our school children in the molding of their education. [Demonstration.]

Mindful as we are of the necessity for international understanding and cooperation, the pacific settlements of disputes, and the establishment through peaceful agreements of proper standards of world conduct, the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes attempts to extend additional power to the United Nations organization, however sincere the purpose might be, at the expense of weakening the security of the United States.

ATTITUDE TOWARD UNITED NATIONS SECURITY FORCES

Senator MANSFIELD. May I ask you a question there, Commander? Mr. Betz. Certainly.

Senator MANSFIELD. Are the Veterans of Foreign Wars in favor of the United Nations security force, as I believe the commander of the American Legion, department of Wisconsin, mentioned in his earlier testimony?

Mr. Betz. Yes; I think we are in favor of a security force, as long as we have our own force under our own control. [Applause.]

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course, if you had such an organization we would still have our own security forces in this country and overseas, as is the case at the present time. But if we establish a United Nations security force, along with other countries, then would you say that we should make such a contribution?

Mr. Betz. Not unless we have the right to pull them out at our own will and discretion. [Applause.]

Senator MANSFIELD. I see.

NO SURRENDER OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Betz. Now, the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes any plan or proposal which would restrict or reduce in any way the sovereignty and independence of the United States. It is deeply convinced that many of the current plans and proposals would, if adopted, have that result and that they would retard rather than advance the very objectives sought to be accomplished by their proponents.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Among such plans which would, in the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have that effect, are proposals for the establishment of a world government or other type of supergovernment. Proponents of such plans, recommend, among other things, that such a supergovernment be based upon the following principles:

One, that membership be opened to all nations without the right of secession.

Two, that world law should be enforceable directly upon individuals.

And three, that such a government should have direct taxing power independent of national taxation. They advocate that one of its powers should be provision prohibiting the possession by any nation of armaments and forces beyond an approved level required for national policing.

These same advocates of world government attempted first to achieve national approval of their plan at the grassroots in the State legislatures. That was their right under the constitution, as one of the methods openly to accomplish the constitutional amendment necessary for their purpose. Their efforts quickly resulted in the adoption by 23 States of resolutions supporting this proposal, some of them requesting Congress to call a national convention to consider constitutional revisions to permit world government. Twenty-one of these twenty-three States have since rescinded their resolutions, while other States have rejected proposals to adopt world government resolutions. The Veterans of Foreign Wars spearheaded that campaign.

This reversal has resulted from the opposition of the people when they become conscious of what was being developed, contrary to their will and detrimental to their best interests. Now, the attention of world government proponents has focused itself upon the Congress and among these proponents are those who believe that their purpose can gradually, if not precipitously, be accomplished through revision

of the United Nations Charter, even without the necessity for constitutional amendment.

PROPOSALS TO REVISE THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Review of the United Nations Charter is contemplated in article 109 (3) which provides that a call for a conference shall be on the agenda of the 10th annual session of the General Assembly, that is in 1955. Our Government has indicated it will favor such a conference.

Under the circumstances, our political leaders will be importuned to stand for:

One, an elimination of restriction upon the "veto power."

Two, the admission to membership in the United Nations of all nations, regardless of the principles under which they are governed.

Three, the establishment of so-called world law, enforceable directly upon individuals.

Four, to vest in a world organization the power to tax.

Five, the power to establish, maintain, and use military forces to enforce "world law" with a prohibition against the maintenance of such forces by sovereign nations, except for police purposes.

And six, the adoption of a convention on human rights.

NO REMOVAL OF VETO POWER

Now, as to the veto power, briefly: At the keystone of the arch of sovereign independence lies the veto power. If exercised wisely and with justice, it is an aid, rather than a detriment, to international progress. Elimination of, or restriction upon, its proper use in the national interest would be entirely or pro tanto to relinquish the rights of our citizens guaranteed by the Constitution. It would vest authority in the United Nations Organization, under certain circumstances, to subjugate our country to determinations in governmental matters by foreign nations, many of which are now unable to govern themselves under comparable democratic principles to our own.

So, therefore, we definitely oppose the removal of the veto power

QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Nations of the world should not, merely because they have reasonably stable governments, and regardless of the political principles under which they govern, be admitted into the United Nations Organization. We should maintain our rights to veto in such matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you place the rest of your statement in the record, please? I think you have had 7 minutes now.

Mr. BETZ. Yes.

In summary, it is the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that no change in the charter should be made which will weaken our national security or sovereignty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Senator GILLETTE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Betz.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Betz, portions of which were not read, is as follows:)

IV. PROPOSALS TO REVISE THE U. N. CHARTER

Review of the United Nations Charter is contemplated in article 109 (3) which provides that a call for a conference shall be on the agenda of the 10th annual session of the General Assembly; that is in 1955. Our Government has indicated it will favor such a conference.

Under the circumstances, our political leaders will be importuned to stand for: (1) An elimination of or restriction upon the "veto power"; (2) the admission to membership in the United Nations of all nations, regardless of the principles under which they are governed; (3) the establishment of so-called "world law," enforceable directly upon individuals; (4) to vest in a world organization the power to tax; (5) the power to establish, maintain, and use military forces to enforce "world law" with a prohibition against the maintenance of such forces by sovereign nations, except for police purposes; and (6) the adoption of a Convention on Human Rights.

(1) *The veto power.*—At the keystone of the arch of sovereign independence lies the veto power. If exercised wisely and with justice, it is an aid, rather than a detriment, to international progress. Elimination of, or restriction upon, its proper use in the national interest would be entirely or pro tanto to relinquish the rights of our citizens guaranteed by the Constitution. It would vest authority in the United Nations Organization under certain circumstances to subjugate our country to determinations in governmental matters by foreign nations, many of which are now unable to govern themselves under comparable democratic principles to our own.

That this is now actively under consideration and that, if established, it would have that effect, is outlined in the committee print of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (83d Cong., 2d sess.) on "The Problem of the Veto in the United Nations Security Council."

In the preface, pages III and IV, is found the following:

"Before Americans take a position with respect to abolishing or limiting the veto they must answer some hard questions, including the following:

"1. Should the United States be willing to give up the veto over United Nations use of American Armed Forces without our consent?

"2. If the veto were abolished in this respect, would a constitutional amendment be necessary to enable us to give effect to a revised charter?

"3. Should the United States be willing to relinquish the veto with respect to the admission of new members to the United Nations?

"4. If the veto were relinquished with respect to membership, should we still seek its retention with respect to the matter of who should represent China in the United Nations?

"5. Should the United States be willing to give up the veto with respect to the international control of atomic energy in the event a feasible control plan is devised?

"Each of these questions, and many others which will occur to the reader of this study, must be considered by members of this subcommittee if they are to submit constructive suggestions to the Senate. The questions must be answered in terms of what is best for the United States. What course of action with respect to the veto provisions of the United Nations Charter will best assure the security and national interests of the United States?

"This study provides a broad framework for a consideration of the veto power and the various proposals which have been made to alter it. Its publication does not indicate either the subcommittee's acceptance or rejection of any of the views which are expressed. Before reaching any conclusions, the subcommittee will want to obtain the thinking of the American people on all the aspects and ramifications of the problem."

In the text, at page 13, is the following:

"Whenever the United States finds itself at variance with the views of the Council's majority, the veto, whether utilized or not, offers as safeguard to the American position. Abolition of the veto would mean giving up that safeguard in matters which heretofore have generally been considered the exclusive concern of the nation. The Security Council, for example, could order the armed forces of member nations into action provided the military agreements envisioned in article 43 were concluded. If the veto were abolished, United States troops

might conceivably be called upon to support a United Nations decision which the United States opposed."

Concern regarding the "veto power" cannot reasonably result from dissatisfaction as to its existence, but can and should stem only from its improper use.

Consequently, we are surprised and deeply concerned that it is referred to in the preface of the document from which we have just quoted as a "kind of monkey wrench in the machinery of the (United Nations) organization" and characterized in the document as an "evil."

We maintain that it is not an evil, but that it is our most valuable sovereign right and the basis upon which our independence and security rest. Efforts to limit its abuse should, of course, be made through persuasion; but it should not be eliminated or restricted.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes any such action.

Elimination in, or restriction upon, the veto power would inevitably affect the following matters. Some, if not all of them, might well be advocated in connection with United Nations Charter revision itself.

(2) *Membership in the U. N.*—Nations of the world should not, merely because they have reasonably stable governments and regardless of the political principles under which they govern, be admitted into the United Nations organization. We should maintain our right of veto in such matters.

While the Soviet nations have vetoed the admission of some 14 nations which might otherwise have been admitted, the United States and other nations have opposed the admission of the mainland government of China.

It is interesting to note that in our domestic consideration as to the admission of States to the Union, our Constitution requires that they have a republican form of government.

(3) *World law, enforceable upon individuals.*—Any such proposal, presupposes: (a) the establishment of international courts with criminal jurisdiction; (b) the enactment of a body of international law, defining new offenses; and (c) the trial of alleged offenders under an international system which would differ from and deprive our citizens of the "due processes" guaranteed under our Bill of Rights.

We oppose any such suggestion.

(4) *The power to tax.*—One need hardly comment upon this suggestion. The people of the United States, and of some other countries, are adequately taxed now. It is one thing, within our willingness and by our own choice, to bear the major portion of the costs of joint international enterprises, but the thought of vesting the power to tax in a world federal government is quite another. This would convert voluntary contribution, over which we have control, into a compulsion which could hardly be expected to be found acceptable to our citizens.

We should always be conscious of the truism, pronounced by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." In fact taxation was one of the main causes of the Revolutionary War. We should not easily surrender that which our forefathers fought to gain.

(5) *World military force.*—At present, there is provision for the contribution of military forces to the United Nations for "police" purposes.

The proposal that the United Nations should be empowered to raise, maintain and use a world military force which might well be used against us is obviously dangerous in the extreme. Coupled with that is the suggestion that sovereign nations be prohibited from maintaining independent national forces of their own, except for police purposes. That would convert the danger into a reality of complete subjugation.

We oppose this.

(6) *Convention on human rights.*—The proposed Convention on Human Rights, purports to establish something comparable to our Bill of Rights, but to which it is repugnant and which, if adopted, it would supersede. It is repugnant because it does not contain a protection against the taking of private property without "due process of law" which our 5th and 14th amendments guarantee. It is repugnant in that it would create rights without recognition of obligations and it is repugnant because, insofar as it appears to guarantee rights, comparable to some of our own, it is hedged with vague language suggesting that these rights might be suspended by governmental fiat. Indeed, it has been said that substantial portions have been taken verbatim from the Soviet Constitution.

V. SUMMARY

It appears clear that there are those, many of whom have the best of intentions, who would involve the United States in a world government or other type of supergovernment.

In the main they are the same groups and individuals who oppose an amendment to our Constitution to protect our internal law against encroachment by treaty or executive agreement. We support such an amendment.

Those who oppose it, since its purpose is solely to protect our own domestic affairs, should be asked what is it they seek to regulate through international agreement which might even be beyond the powers of our own Federal Government as granted it by the Constitution.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, consistent with its recognized patriotic purposes and its opposition to any form of world or other supergovernment, urges the rejection by our Government of the various proposals outlined in this statement, and any others, which would alter the United Nations Charter so as to abolish or restrict the sovereignty and independence of the United States, as being detrimental to the security of our country.

Such plans are, likewise, opposed by many organizations in this country, including the American Legion, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Sons of the American Revolution, and the National Sojourners, to mention a few, and we are convinced that they are opposed by the vast majority of our citizens.

Our leaders, and we as individuals, should be constantly aware of the dangers which beset us. We should be vigilant to guard against the entrapment of our country in the pursuit of elusive panaceas of false prophets, lest constitutional governments become a mere memory in America.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dennis Murphy, Milwaukee County Federation of High School Young Republicans.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS MURPHY, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I am Dennis Murphy, of 1839 North 25th Street. I am speaking as the representative of the Milwaukee County Federation of High School Young Republican Clubs, which is composed of young Republicans at East, Whitefish Bay, Messmer, Country Day, Holy Angels, Shorewood, Lutheran, and Marquette High Schools.

Before entering into the question of the United Nations, I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the committee for this opportunity to present the views of our organization. We sincerely hope that the United States and the United Nations may profit from the work of this subcommittee.

Gentlemen, the United Nations Assembly conducts its meetings in a fluorescent-lighted, air-conditioned building, an example of the best of modern architecture. The United Nations Charter, the reason why this building was erected, is its very antithesis. The charter is like a building which was erected on swampy land, constructed of green wood, and then advertised and glorified as being the house to end the housing problem. Thus the United Nations began.

Now, when the green wood has warped, and the foundation has sunk into mire, the true picture of the United Nations is revealed. The defects and weaknesses are open to the world to be seen, and also to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is a defect in the instrument or human nature?

Mr. MURPHY. Primarily it is a defect of human nature, although there are defects in the nature of the charter.

The CHAIRMAN. One gentleman said to me last night when we were driving in a Cadillac car, "The car is a wonderful car, but if you put it in the hands of a crazy person, it won't be a wonderful car very long."

What suggestions can we get that might improve not only the mechanism but the driver.

Mr. MURPHY. I have some such suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, if you will carry on, please.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CHARTER

Mr. MURPHY. The world is far from peace, the primary objective of the United Nations. It is, in fact, getting further from peace daily because of the arms race. No agreement has been formulated for the control of nuclear weapons. The weakness of the Security Council's veto power has yet to be corrected. America still bears too much of the United Nations' expense load. The International Court of Justice is merely a shadow of what it should be because of the haziness of international law. Such problems can be blithely named for hours, but to what end? We are here today to provide a remedy for them, to arrive at their respective solutions.

There is a powerful movement today to make the United Nations a world government, by giving it more powers. Would it be wise to add another floor, an attic, even make a skyscraper out of the feeble framework and unsubstantial foundation of the United Nations? We of the high school federation of young Republicans believe that this would be the case, that the United Nations is not sufficiently developed nor its member nations ready for world government.

A possible and logical way to like the problem would be to tear out the green, warped sections and replace them with seasoned planks. The foundation could then be filled in and shorn up. Achieved then would be, not a high monstrosity ready to collapse and shatter all hope of success, but a compact and suitable site for the solution of world peace.

It would be impossible to cover all the problems, because of the reasonable limits of time imposed by this committee, and so we would like to treat on those we consider most important: The disarmament and control of nuclear weapons; the veto power of the Security Council; and the godlessness in the United Nations.

This last proposal may surprise some of you, coming, as it does, from a group of young people. Youth, even in a Christian Nation like America, are seldom represented as being devout about anything or interested in anything above the material. We believe, however, that the key to world peace lies in God. The United Nations would be wise to recognize the creator of the world as they plan world peace.

NOT REMOVAL BUT MODIFICATION OF THE VETO

The problem of the veto power is a knotty one. The United Nations now is partially hamstrung because even in a case of definite aggression, any of the Big Five nations on the Security Council can always

veto the use of military force against itself. In the Korean war the power of veto prevented Russia from being named the aggressor.

But the veto cannot be crossed off the charter. It would leave America naked and unprotected against any popular proposals by a group of nations. If the veto power were dissolved, there would be no other alternative for the United States but to officially leave the United Nations.

This power could, and should be modified, particularly where it applies to settling a dispute by peaceful means. In this case the veto is an unnecessary privilege and should be denied. When the United Nations decides that a dispute can be settled by some peaceful method, any member involved in the dispute is permitted neither to vote nor veto, and, therefore, does not need the power for its own protection. Why should another member, not involved in the disagreement be allowed to veto the peaceful settlement, and so make military action and war necessary? The use of the veto power in such a situation should, therefore, be restricted.

THE ARMAMENT RACE

When the many nations signed the United Nations Charter, they promised according to article 2, section 4—

to refrain * * * from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State * * *

Apparently few nations have stopped to consider this. The principal countries of the world are speeding along in an armament race. Though the race for nuclear weapons is the most deadly and serious thing in the world today, it is also the most foolish—the race has no end and will have no winner. Russia and America are rushing along a mad course: The United States takes the lead, glances over his shoulder at Russia as he spurts forward; both pour in more energy, money, resources; they strain, neck and neck, but where are they going? There is no finish line, no victor, unless one or both succeed in blowing up their countries and maybe the world too.

This whole fantastic fetish could be ended here and now if both countries simply agreed to stop, and agreed to reasonable means of enforcing the stop, including an effective system of inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. Your country would be glad to do that any time, if you can get an enforceable agreement. That is the issue.

Mr. MORPHY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any solution to that?

Mr. MURPHY. Unless Russia so agrees, and thorough checks and inspections are instituted, the United States should neither hand over its lead in the armament race, nor lag in its efforts to hold that lead.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Just a minute, young man.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I just want Mr. Murphy to know that his statement is an excellent one, and I am delighted that he has come before the committee as a representative, not of the young Republicans of Milwaukee County, but as a representative of the younger generation who are going to have to face up to these problems which are confronting us at the present time.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say, Mr. Murphy, that that comes from a brother Democrat to a brother Republican.

Now, the next speaker is Mr. Thomas W. Korb.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS W. KORB, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. KORB. Senators, my appearance before this subcommittee is with mixed feelings and an acute realization of the unimportance of the individual in the scheme of international relations. Out of this hearing will come nothing more than a box score registering the number of appearances and the totals for and against the United Nations. When this and similar hearings have been completed, the box score will show overwhelmingly in favor of the United Nations and against the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, Tom, I have to disagree at once. That is not the purpose of this hearing whatsoever, and there will be no counting of noses. What we are looking for are suggestions like those we are getting right here as to how the United Nations can be made a more effective weapon for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. KORB. Well, Senator, the box score will show, as we have found out from the Akron hearings.

I predict this because I am confident that the American Fabians, visionaries, giddy minds, do-gooders, the thoughtless, and disinterested will all be alined with the world federalists in the announced aim of subjecting and subjugating every American citizen to international rules.

DISCONTINUE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE U. N.

I am against a continuation of United States participation in the United Nations for many reasons which time allotted me prohibits my reciting, but which basically stems from my firm conviction that under the United Nations, individuality, nationality, and Christianity are doomed.

Had the United Nations been in existence in the middle of the 18th Century, the United States would never have been formed. The history of this great Nation, as used to be taught in the schools of this country, would never have been made. The names of great American heroes would never have been planted in the minds and the hearts of growing youth. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Emancipation Proclamation would never have lived.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you realize that since the United Nations has come into being how many independent nations have come into being? [Applause.] There are 10 in the Far East; so that belies your statement.

Mr. KORB. I realize, Senator, that since the United Nations has come into being 600 million people have been lost to civilization and have been put under prisonership of the Communist rule. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is not due to the United Nations, sir. Other nations have come into being as free nations, and colonialism is on the way out because of United Nations. [Applause.]

And we were a colony in those days.

Mr. KORB. Of course, I do not have the advantage of debate with the Senator here, because my time is limited to a 5-minute presentation. I prepared it on that basis.

However, I would be willing at any time to debate the matter with the Senator in greater detail.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree fully that I probably should not have interrupted you. We are here to get your suggestions, and your suggestion is that the United Nations should go out the window.

Mr. KORB. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is the right of every American citizen to have that idea.

Mr. KORB. No, sir; my statement was that we cease participation in the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is equivalent to it going out the window. [Applause.]

Mr. KORB. That may be an indirect benefit which I might be pleased to see too, sir. [Laughter.]

THE U. N. AS A SUPERSTATE

All but infirm minds must recognize that the decline of the republic to which allegiance is still sporadically pledged has begun. With the help of good, but misinformed people, the busy internationalists will soon make the United States a mere political subdivision of the world federation. Patriotism will then be a dirty word. Everyone over the age of 21 has lived during a time when the municipality has given way to the county, the county has given way to the State, the State has given way to the Federal Government. Our Federal Government has been given away to the world federation.

I admit selection against the United Nations Charter in calling to the attention of the American people certain articles for their particular study. And while the real meanings of these articles must necessarily stand the test of time, practice, and application before we know what they are, I believe the listeners and this committee will agree with me in my interpretation.

The United Nations Charter specifically provides that it supersedes the Constitution of the United States (arts. 25, 102, 103, and 104). The Court of International Justice is now the court of last resort (art. 60 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice), and its decisions may be completely ignored by the Security Council of the United Nations (arts. 12 and 24).

I refer to article 2, section 2, and I quote:

All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

I also quote article 25:

The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present charter.

This means we are bound to obey the determinations of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

BROAD POWERS OF THE U. N.

I am aware of section 7 of this same article, which presumably prohibits the United Nations intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. However, the exception "but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter 7" immediately negatives all of section 7 as though it were not written. For instances, under chapter 7, undoubtedly, the enforcement of the so-called Genocide Convention would fall. Under the Genocide Convention, already adopted by 40 nations, if an American citizen should give offense to someone of different race or creed or color, thereby causing him "mental harm," he could, if the United States refused to prosecute him, be transported overseas for trial before an international tribunal. Other conventions by other of the United Nations agencies could be dreamed up, and if adopted, subject every action of a United States citizen to international scrutiny.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the 14 United States Senators who voted against the Status of Armed Forces Agreement in a noble but futile attempt to prevent divesting of United States servicemen in other countries of their citizenship as United States citizens under the protection of the American Constitution. The brutality of this law will be known only in the small circle of family and friends of victims of this un-American act.

I referred to agencies of the United Nations. I use the phrase "scrutiny of the individual acts" of United States citizens. Articles 13 and 57 of the United Nations Charter gives the right to such agencies to inquire into, make recommendations and secure the adoption of laws in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields. The Federal Government under the Constitution of the United States does not have this right as of today. I know of no activity of a human being that would not fall within one of the categories recited in articles 13 and 57 of the United Nations Charter. The United States now is less than 2 percent effective on the basis of voting power in world affairs. The State of Wisconsin, by population, and assuming the same ratio would apply as to voters, is $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the United States. I represent less than one three-millionth of the State of Wisconsin. I hope I shall not continue lonely long. I hope I can convince more voters, more Congressmen and Senators that the defect of the United Nations is not that it is weak and impotent, as other witnesses have testified, but that it is strong, dangerous, and un-American. I hope I can convince more voters and more of our elected representatives that the United Nations is not just a debating society, but a propaganda organization capable of gentle or forceful persuasion, and a very satisfactory weapon for those who wish to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.

POWERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT

Article 94 under Chapter 14, the International Court of Justice, provides the weapon to be used or not to be used, depending upon the whim of the Security Council. For the benefit of the audience not

having readily available a copy of the United Nations Charter, I quote article 94, section 1:

Each member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

Section 2:

If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

To those Americans who still believe that if it is necessary to go to war such war must be won I say that since 1950 the United Nations combined to defeat the United States. [Applause.] The Korean war is the only war that has ever been lost by the United States. Other members of the United Nations benefited economically by the United States' sacrifice of 134,000 casualties, and billions of dollars of resources.

Indochina is next.

Israel, Jordan, Egypt, and Arabia will then follow.

VALUE OF THE U. N.

Has the United Nations been of assistance to the world?

I answered the Senator before, I said since its adoption in 1945, 600 million people have been lost to communism, which the Charter of the United Nations was purportedly designed to prevent.

Has the United Nations been of help to the United States?

Articles 48 and 49 were completely ignored by the members of the United Nations, or at best, only token aid was afforded the United States in the Korean war.

Article 45 takes from the United States Congress the constitutional obligation and responsibility to declare war. It prevents the President of the United States from instituting discretionary police action. It impounds men, machines, and materials.

The newspapers carried accounts of differences between Truman and Dulles and other members of the Government with respect to the sharing of the A bomb, H bomb, and cobalt bomb secrets with other nations. The argument is moot. These bombs and their secrets were given away in San Francisco by Hiss and White, and it only remains for the Security Council to demand it. For the information of those who do not agree, I suggest reading articles 26, 47, and 48, in addition to article 5.

Time does not permit my offering a substitute for the United Nations. [Laughter.] May I suggest a comparison of the United Nations Charter with the Wisconsin constitution and the Constitution of the United States. The State and Federal Constitutions will be dead history under the full utilization of the United Nations rights and powers. The United States "a free nation under God"; the people of Wisconsin, "grateful to Almighty God" will be neutralized, socialized, collectivized, communized. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions, gentlemen?

Senator GILLETTE. Yes; I have a couple of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, please.

Mr. KORA. Yes, Senator.

OPPOSITION TO THE U. N.

Senator GILLETTE. I have a couple of questions that I should like to ask you. You understand, of course, in the work we are trying to do, we receive opinions of all kinds. We don't necessarily agree with them, and we certainly do not find any fault with people presenting their viewpoint, whether we agree with them or not.

But as I understand your presentation, you are definitely opposed to the United Nations in any form?

Mr. KORB. In the form in which it is presently written; yes, I am.

Senator GILLETTE. Well, you did not answer my question. In the form it is presently written in, or under any suggestions you would make for revision?

Mr. KORB. When the Senator says "in any form," I cannot offer an opinion "yes" or "no" to it, until I see the form which it takes.

Senator GILLETTE. Let me ask you this—

Mr. KORB. I say the present U. N. Charter cannot be effectively amended to protect the interests of the United States, or any free nation. [Applause.]

Senator GILLETTE. Let me ask you this question (reading):

AGREEMENT WITH PURPOSES OF CHARTER

The purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end; to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace * * *.

Are you in favor of efforts of that kind?

Mr. KORB. Yes; I am, sir.

Senator GILLETTE (continuing).

And to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; * * *.

Are you in favor of that?

Mr. KORB. Yes, sir.

Senator GILLETTE (continuing).

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples * * *.

Are you in favor of that?

Mr. KORB. Yes, sir.

Senator GILLETTE. Well, then, you don't consider that a pact adopted by the Senate of the United States, or ratified, by a vote of 89 to 2 is anti-United States?

Mr. KORB. I say, Senator Gillette, that the preamble which you read is good, but the articles following that preamble, beginning with article 2, are designed so as to make it possible to defeat all the principles recited in the preamble. [Applause.]

SENATE ACTION ON CHARTER

Senator GILLETTE. Well, I don't want to engage in a personal altercation with you, but I happen to have been a member of a group of 8 or 9 Senators who worked over 4 months in the formulation of the original United Nations Charter that was presented—

Mr. KORB. I am aware of that, sir.

Senator GUJERRE. And we had as members of that group Democrats and Republicans—Senator Vandenberg, Senator Austin, Senator White, Senator Barkley, Senator George, and others that do not occur to me at the present time.

In trying to formulate this charter for presentation, consideration, and ratification, we did not consider ourselves visionaries, giddy minds, do-gooders, or thoughtless men, or alined with any group that seeks to destroy or leave the United States, and it rather surprises me to hear anyone state that anyone who is desirous of strengthening, in the light of experience, the pact which we entered by a vote of 89 to 2, are still do-gooders, and are expecting and hoping to leave the United States for an organization to destroy the great country of ours. [Applause.]

Mr. KORB. Senator, I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's have order, please. We must carry on; we have very little time. I have known Tom Korb for many years, and I have known his views. He is very set in those views, as we are all set in our views. Thank God that in America we can have different views and still be friends and carry on. We don't get shot for differences in views. [Applause.]

I will now call on Mr. Charles Gruender, representing the Wisconsin and Milwaukee County CIO. We are very happy to have you here, sir.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES GRUENDER, MILWAUKEE WIS.

Mr. GRUENDER. I want to express my appreciation of Senator Gillette's defense of the United Nations, and in behalf of the Wisconsin and Milwaukee CIO, I want to express our gratitude in being able to testify.

Before we give our recommendations we want to state and affirm that there is so much good in the U. N. Charter as it is, if sincerely applied, and lived up to, with the same high spirits with which it was written that still makes it the greatest human document, one of great human documents of history. [Applause.]

The preamble states:

To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security.

But there is sniping of the United Nations in this country, and I think sometimes we forget some of the basic roots which nourished our own America in its growth.

The UNESCO literature is being barred in some schools in Texas. Our Government has withdrawn support of the weather ships in the North Atlantic. The International Labor Organization, an agency of the United Nations, is being attacked, and its effectiveness undermined by certain interests. We wonder if the profits from investment in cheap labor overseas is not beclouding their vision of a world free from fear and want.

The CIO believes that as long as there are low standards of living, as long as there is poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy, these are a threat to our own prosperity and our own security.

We do not view Americanism in the narrow sense of crawling within our national shell. The individual does not lose personally by taking an active part in his community, he does not lose anything when he partakes of any action in his community. He enlarges his personality. So the CIO believes that we are practicing the true spirit of Americanism by extending our privileges of freedom and progress everywhere. [Applause.]

The only thing we need to fear is the danger of destroying ourselves by a too narrow view of our industrial, political, and economic life. Our greatest strength in this country lies in all of us working together in a spirit of cooperation and freedom and good will.

Working together with other peoples in the United Nations' organization we are building the real understanding that makes for lasting peace.

PROPOSALS FOR REVISION

We recommend the following changes for the strengthening of the United Nations:

First, the creation of a new armament council equal in standing with the trusteeship and Economic and Social Council. Its function to be the general and genuine armament control, including atomic and thermonuclear energy, with full power of inspection.

Second, universal membership, with elimination of veto as regards membership.

Third, proportional representation in the Assembly according to population.

Fourth, greater scope and authority to the International Court.

Fifth, activation of the police force for international enforcement action against aggression.

Sixth, modification of the veto with reference to pacific settlement of disputes.

Seventh, expansion of powers to meet the human needs of hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions?

Senator GILLETTE. No questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GRUNDEN. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. William J. Mulligan, student, Marquette University.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. MULLIGAN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. MULLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee; I am William J. Mulligan, 3451 North Maryland Avenue, a senior at Marquette University High School in Milwaukee. I appreciate the privilege of appearing before your committee to offer my opinions on the revision of the Charter of the United Nations organization.

I come before you today as a youth. We, the young people of America, are most vitally interested in the problem of the revision of the Charter, and in the workings of our Government. Our lives and our futures most probably are inseparably linked to the problems of world peace.

The problem of revising the United Nations Charter is a most serious one which affects the youth of America in every respect, for we, undoubtedly, will have to live under the United Nations for many years to come.

The headlines scream A-bombs and H-bombs and germ warfare, and paint a doleful existence for our generation. We are told that in these trying days we have nowhere to turn but to a United Nations' movement.

However, the youth of America will not panic! We want to face the future calmly and realistically. We believe that there is a place for the United Nations, but cannot see it as a panacea for all of the woes of the universe.

CRITICISMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

It is hard for us to place our confidence in the United Nations as presently constituted! There are many things that bother us about the present conditions in the United Nations. History has taught us that it is absolute foolishness to place the responsibility for the welfare of any nation in the hands of a world assembly. The League of Nations, and the Holy Alliance, were dismal and appalling failures.

We have been placed in the bondage of debt by the crushing burden of the United Nations and United Nations' "police actions." We feel the load is too heavy for us, and resent it, and will continue to resent it, until all nations bear their equal cost.

We also look with dismay on the so-called Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by which the United Nations assumes the role of the dispenser of human rights and dignity to all men.

It is very obvious, even to youth, that this presents many problems to our freedom and liberty and is presumptuous. We believe that human rights and human dignity are God-given, and not U. N.-given. Documents, as the one just mentioned, will not help gain freedom, but will possibly jeopardize it.

We are distressed and aghast that men would even presume to organize a group for peace and unity, without mentioning the name of God, the Prince of Peace, in its Charter. We believe that the omission of the invocation lends an atheistic tone to the Charter, and it worries and discourages us.

We have looked for accomplishments by the United Nations and find very few. We were involved in a United Nations maneuver in Korea which took thousands of lives and 3 years. As American youths, we recognize the fact that we must defend our country with pride and valor when attacked, but we do not relish the idea of fighting crusades all over the globe to enforce decrees made by the United Nations.

We have looked to the United Nations for the answer to many questions, and we have not found them. The narcotics problem is worse today than ever before; the Israel-Arab question remains incendiary; the Korean problem is far from settled; 100 million people per year are lost to communism; Egypt and England are still in dispute over Suez; the battle in Indochina is a hot war; there is failure to declare Russia and China as the aggressors in Korea. It appears to us that the United Nations, as presently constituted, is woefully ineffective.

CHOICES REGARDING THE U. N.

Therefore, gentlemen, we are confronted with three choices in regard to the United Nations.

(1) Greatly strengthen the powers in the Charter of the United Nations, to allow the United Nations to evolve into a world government, as advocated by the American Association for the United Nations, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the United World Federalists.

This would most certainly mean the abolition of national sovereignty and an open door to socialism, with the resultant end of initiative and private enterprise. The strengthening of the United Nations Charter into the foundation for a world government, therefore, would not end the problems of the world, but would add new and greater ones. We would find American troops subjugated to world control, fantastic bureaucracy, international attempts to standardize living by pulling America down, and outrageous taxation. These would be new and unsurmountable threats. We do not think that this, then, is the answer.

(2) The second choice would be to withdraw completely from the United Nations. Although there might be some merit in this, it is not pertinent in this discussion of the revision of the United Nations Charter.

(3) The third choice, which seems the most logical and necessary, is that there should be sweeping changes in the Charter of the United Nations directed toward modifying the powers of the organization.

MODIFYING THE POWERS OF THE U. N.

These changes should be as follows:

1. At the beginning of the charter, the help of God should be invoked.

2. Article 1, subsection 1, should be revised to eliminate the following—

effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

In this connection, articles 42-48 inclusive should also be deleted. This would eliminate the military powers of the United Nations, and would end the sending of troops to fight international "police actions."

It would also eliminate the hopeless policy tangles which we presently witness in the United Nations, as aggressor nations are able to pass judgment on military maneuvers. Fiascos, such as the U. N. refusal to permit the carrying of the Korean war to a successful conclusion, would be ended.

Evidently, we have lost confidence in the military actions of the United Nations, or we would not be tying ourselves up with power blocs such as NATO, for example, and other defense organizations.

3. Article 4, subsection 1, should be amended to add the qualification that membership is open to those "peaceful" countries only if they have not been aggressors during the last 10 years.

4. Article 5 should be amended to make suspension of rights and privileges automatic in the case of nations which violate the charter.

The approval of the General Assembly should be required before those nations could be reinstated.

5. Article 17, subsection 2, should be written to provide that each nation carries its share of the expenses.

6. Article 55 should be rewritten to provide for a study and recommendation only in these fields.

7. Article 66 should be deleted.

8. Article 103 should be deleted in its entirety because it is a threat to the integrity and sovereignty of member nations.

NO MODIFICATION OF THE VETO OR CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT

In addition to these changes, it is our belief that article 27, subsection 3, which provides for the veto power in the Security Council, should be retained.

We also believe that it would be foolhardy to enter into a United Nations controlled atomic or hydrogen disarmament. Russia was not to be trusted when we were "allies," and there is no reason to believe that Russia would cooperate honestly in a disarmament plan where our secrets were involved. We believe that United States possession of these weapons is at least a partial guaranty of peace.

We believe that a further general revamping in the character of the United Nations should be made to provide that all actions of the United Nations will be purely advisory. This would be a guaranty that no United Nations legislation would become integral law of the involved countries.

It should be provided that all advisory motions must be ratified and approved by the member governments. All intergovernmental recommendations would be effective only through direct treaties made between interested nations.

The charter, revised in this way, would restore respect of the people toward the United Nations. It would ease the fear of loss of national sovereignty and restore national pride.

CONSULTING YOUTH MORE

I might also suggest, though at the risk of appearing to be a lobbyist for youth, that it might be well to have one young person represented on the delegation of each country in an auxiliary capacity. Young people often see issues clearly and from different aspects, and could be helpful to the older diplomats. Older diplomats might be sometimes more interested in saving face, while younger people might be more interested in saving life.

I thank you most kindly for your attention. I am sure that many people will have ideas different from those I have mentioned. It is one of the wonderful things about this country that we may all have our day in court. I sincerely hope that you will ponder my suggestions. The young people today are worried and upset and hope that the United Nations can help bridge the dangerous waters of the future. But, we don't want to be sent all over the world by the United Nations, and we believe firmly that our national sovereignty should remain intact and unscathed.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. I believe Senator Mansfield has some questions he would like to ask you.

Senator MANSFIELD. Would you continue to believe in the United Nations, if it is strengthened as a result of the revision contemplated for next year?

Mr. MULLIGAN. I think that it would be the worst tragedy that ever came about if the United Nations was strengthened into a world government.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is not the answer to my question, but I think I will use that to make a statement.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no Senator or Congressman who is in favor of world government. I don't know where the idea has taken root that such is the case, insofar as these hearings are concerned. I want to assure you, on my word, that there has been no consideration by this committee—and may I repeat, to the best of my knowledge, by no Senator or Congressman of the United States—in any way, shape or form of the establishment of a world government to which we would be subservient, or any kind of world government.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Our next witness will be the Reverend Everett W. McNair of the National and International Relations Departments of Milwaukee County Council of Churches.

STATEMENT OF REV. EVERETT W. MCNAIR, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Reverend MCNAIR. I am minister of Plymouth Congregational Church. I represent the Milwaukee County Council of Churches, and I have been informally asked to represent the Wisconsin Council of Churches, but my opinions will be my own, I cannot represent the opinions of any of these organizations.

I am for all strengthening of the United Nations Charter that might increase the very effective work now done by the United Nations, in educational, cultural, and welfare activities. I have observed some of these and am very much in favor of them.

ELIMINATION OF WAR

Primarily I am concerned with the elimination of war and the strengthening of the United Nations for that purpose. I am all for the bringing about of broad and peaceful relations among nations.

I draw on my principles of American history, as illustrated in the reconstruction period in the United States beginning in 1866. Civil War was then expected to recur, and frequently and soon. It did not recur, and for two reasons:

First, other, more peaceful means of adjustment of disputes was provided. The southern leaders at that time could always hope that the Federal courts and the Congress would provide them justice by peaceful means.

The second reason was, when there was not full justice, there is always that margin of safety provided by natural reluctance to appeal to war, there was that natural reluctance of mankind to go to war, for war is not always just a crime to be outlawed. Maintenance of the status quo is never the final goal. War is actually a means of settling the inevitable disputes that arise between nations. War is a

tragically costly means, but nevertheless a means of settlement. Unless other means are found there will always be war. In seeking other means we must always keep within the margin of safety.

What is new today, of course, is the unbelievable costliness of war, in terms of human destructiveness. This widens the margin of safety, but heightens the fear of other nations. When some people hear of bombs or 15 or 20 megatons of power, they instinctively contract their loyalty, appeal to the patriotism of their great grandfathers, and seek to make the United States a sanctuary in a world of storm. They condemn all world sovereignty as visionary, fanatical, disloyal subversiveness—"one-world treason at its worst."

They cry out against the wider loyalty, much as certain citizens did in 1789, when the United States Constitution was ratified over their fiery warnings. These people fail to face the facts. Today there is no sanctuary, no safety in military preparedness or military alliances. Today we must have a United Nations strong enough to provide peaceful means of settlement of differences among nations.

Ideally, therefore, I am for universal enforceable disarmament on all large nations in the United Nations and without the right of veto. I am for an international inspectorate and an international police force, along with increased world legislative powers, for the review of disputes, colonial policies, combination of small nations by big nations. I am for a growing body of international law, and for increased use of it. I am for increased international constructive services under the United Nations.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP INCLUDING RED CHINA

For achievable goals for the United Nations Charter today, however, we must be more practical. I urge universal membership of nations in the United Nations, or at least the elimination of the veto on questions of admission of member nations.

I ask the elimination of the veto in matters of peaceful settlement of disputes, the formation of a permanent disarmament council, and the provision of more frequent meetings of the United Nations Assembly.

In considering universal membership of nations, we should remember that it would admit a number of important nations now excluded by the veto. Most controversial here is membership for continental China. I urge that this nation also be included, because:

1. Continental China is the actual government of the largest nation in the world.

2. We need her across the conference table where we can deal with her, exactly as we need the Soviet Union there.

3. Exclusion of China under present conditions of heightened spirit of revolt and suspicion in all Oriental nations actually goads her into intransigence.

4. While making final peace for Korea should be a condition, there should be recognition that China has already yielded much there.

5. While a negotiated peace in Indochina should accompany admission of China, it should eliminate French colonialism there.

6. Our chief allies in the United Nations want China admitted. Only American "political possibilities" exclude her today.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you in favor of abolishing the veto absolutely, or would you simply modify the veto?

Reverend McNAIR. At the present time I would modify the veto in the two ways given, by peaceful settlement of disputes, they should have no veto, and the admission of member nations should have no veto.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen any indication in recent events that the Kremlin, or any of the Kremlin's satellites, are more inclined toward peace than they have been in the past?

Reverend McNAIR. Those indications are always slight. There was a time not long ago when we believed that China, dominated by Russia, would never yield on the prisoner issue, but they have finally yielded after long negotiation. It will be slow.

The CHAIRMAN. Does Indochina indicate that the Kremlin or China is interested in peace, or are they following their usual policies of simply having satellite nations do the fighting?

Reverend McNAIR. I think the Russians are tough and evil and military in their point of view, and will continue to be that way, so long as they are not opposed by the will of the nations of the world. I think they can have their wings trimmed by the United Nations activities.

I think in the Indochina situation we must remember that to them it is a colonial empire—that it is colonial imperialism by white nations over the oriental nations, and that looms largest with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't admission of Red China increase its power and prestige in the West, and also increase the prestige of the Kremlin?

Reverend McNAIR. I think it would. I think it would also increase our prestige with India and all other oriental nations as having recognized the importance of the oriental world. I think it would bring about a more even give and take and less intransigent policies in the whole Asian bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that would be good for the free world?

Reverend McNAIR. Yes, I do; because I think the oriental world is going to be powerful anyway, and we have got to face that fact.

Two vetoes are no more devastating to constructive action in the United Nations than one.

Senator MANSFIELD. Reverend McNAIR, I have listened to your statement with a great deal of interest, and I admire your courage.

Reverend McNAIR. Thank you.

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION DUE TO A SHRINKING WORLD

Senator MANSFIELD. May I make this statement? As I understand it, you can fly anywhere in the world from Milwaukee in less than 40 hours at the present time. Does that have any significance to you, and should it have any significance to the American people?

Reverend McNAIR. It means that there is no sanctuary, there is no safety in military preparedness, and ultimately no safety in military alliances, that we must have the will of the world for a peace effective upon every individual nation therein. [Applause.]

Senator MANSFIELD. In other words, then, Reverend McNAIR, we just cannot live alone in isolation?

Reverend McNair. That is right.

Senator Mansfield. If we are going to live in this day of technical research and the development of such things as jet planes, the A-bomb, the H-bomb, and as one of the previous witnesses mentioned, the cobalt bomb, which is the most terrible of all, we are going to have to live with one another and make the best of it if we are going to live at all.

Reverend McNair. Yes.

Senator Mansfield. Probably the best way to do that is to make the United Nations strong, keeping in mind the fact that the United Nations was created for the purpose of coming into operation once peace has been established. There has been no peace since the establishment of the United Nations, and before. What we will have to do, if we all want to live, is to work out some degree of international cooperation which does not mean world government, in my opinion, but does mean understanding of one another, and a little more neighborliness. The best way to do it, I think, would be by strengthening this organization, which the United States Senate passed by 89 to 2, and the fight for which was led by the great Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan.

The Chairman. I would like to say a brief word before the next witness appears. Our friends in television and radio are bringing to a close their broadcasting of the proceedings.

Tape recordings are, however, going to be made of subsequent discussion, and they will be broadcast later on.

I should like to express my deep thanks to the stations for their cooperation in carrying these proceedings. I know that the witnesses who will appear now and in the afternoon, no doubt, had hoped that their testimony might have been heard both on television and on radio.

Thanks again to our friends in television, and thanks to the viewing audience for their attention to our work today.

We will stand adjourned for 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, after which the following proceedings were had:)

The Chairman. Let us come to order, please.

Our next witness is William J. Morgan. He appears on behalf of himself and also on behalf of the G. O. P. Clubs, Inc.

I have known Bill Morgan since we were young lawyers together, and I am glad to see him so full of vim.

Carry on, Bill.

Mr. Morgan. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. MORGAN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. Morgan. Senators and friends, to me, the question of getting out of the United Nations is irrelevant. We not only entered the United Nations, but we were the bellwether that led many, many nations into the United Nations. I think in honor, in national honor, we cannot now withdraw from the United Nations, unless it be that the very security of the United States is threatened; unless the Republic itself is in danger; or unless we have a firm conviction that the rights that our Constitution guarantees our people are surely threatened.

The Chairman. You mean threatened by virtue of that association?

111

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NATIONS

Mr. MORGAN. That is right, Senator. Now, it seems to me that the people who favor a world government—and I am familiar with the Senate's action on that, and it gave me a great deal of gratification, Senator—but it seems to me that these people are not looking beyond their own horizons. They do not seem to realize that we are not the normal people of the world; we are unique.

Over one-half the people of the world are still living in huts of mud and straw, over one-half of the world depends upon their own two legs or small beasts of burden for transport. They have nothing to eat, save what their own families raise.

Senator, if you were to go into a Bedonin village, or any other place, where they had never been outside the village, and to tell them your age, they wouldn't believe you, for ever—

The CHAIRMAN. A lot of people here don't either. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORGAN. But these people wouldn't believe you, Senator, because in their experience they have less than half our expectancy of human life. They see over half of their children die in infancy.

Now then, if that be true, how can their governments finance the declaration of human rights of the United Nations? How can they implement the covenants and human rights of the International Labor Organization?

If you were to take the water of Lake Winnebago, and add them to Lake Michigan, to try to raise the level of Lake Michigan, Senator, you wouldn't appreciably raise the waters in Lake Michigan, but you would drain Winnebago.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they are both clean, however.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, in spots they are, and in spots they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought all Wisconsin water and folks were clean.

Mr. MORGAN. No, I cannot agree with you. Yes, all folks, but not all waters.

Now, it is also true that over half the people of the world have never expressed a choice of how they should be governed. Are they then ready to participate in world government?

I am not one who believes that we have only the alternative of the chains of communism, or the shackles and fetters of a socialized world state.

I believe that we can take experience from the farmers on our plains, when they would have a prairie fire, they would sometimes build a backfire to stop the flames from consuming their buildings, but a contrary wind would drive those flames toward their own holdings and wipe out all they had.

The CHAIRMAN. Bill, you speak like a politician. I have heard of backfiring in politics.

Mr. MORGAN. Senator, a politician who is seeking to better his country, I will be proud at all times to be, and I have no apology for any political campaign I ever made.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the backfire, you understand.

Mr. MORGAN. All right. I built a backfire on the Socialists, on the Socialist leadership, and I am trying to build the same backfire against world federalists today, but I want to be sure that the wind is favorable.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the United Nations?

Mr. MORGAN. I am coming to expressing recommendations, and may I say this—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have them in writing?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, but I would like to point them out to you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Remember, we are only allowing each one 5 minutes, otherwise you will be trespassing on somebody else's rights.

Mr. MORGAN. I will confine myself to that, if I am not interrupted too much.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We are old-time sidekicks, and I have to recognize you.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, we have met before on many occasions, Senator.

Let me say this, these amendments were debated before the 18th Ward Republican Club last Monday night, and the world federation side was presented by a man who will be on this program, a member of the faculty of our own University of Milwaukee, and the club thereafter voted unanimously in favor of these amendments, so I can speak for them also.

DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE STRENGTHENED

Now, the first amendment that I would make would be in reference to the seventh principle of article II, where I would add the words "by such State's constitution," so that it would read:

Nothing in its charter shall ever authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially, or by such state's constitution, within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter, but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter 7.

LIMITING BUT NOT REMOVING THE VETO

I shall proceed now to our next amendment, which is article 17 of the charter—no, no, I want to first mention another amendment, and that is as to the veto power. I am definitely opposed to the elimination of the veto power, because, surely, there will come a time when our country will be in the minority, and it will be our sole means of salvation. [Applause.]

The abolition of the veto power today will mean the immediate supplanting of Nationalist China by Communist China.

Then I would say this, when it comes to the veto power, that that should be amended so that it could be exercised only in cases where the vetoing power had a bona fide conviction that the applicant nation had been guilty of aggression within a stated period of years, or failed to show it was capable of self-government.

Now, I am convinced, Senators, that the hope of a free world is an America that is free, solvent—solvent, solvent—and sovereign.

The CHAIRMAN. That is straight thinking. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN. Is my time about up? I don't want to trespass on anybody's time, but I could tell you more if you wish to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear you, Bill.

OBSERVING THE COMMANDMENTS

Mr. MORGAN. It seems to me, Senator, that these boys, of whom I am immensely proud, these young Americans who came before you, stressed the thought that I would bring to your attention in another way: 2,000 years ago our Heavenly Father sacrificed on the cross our Saviour, and since that time disciples, martyrs, devoted men and women have devoted themselves to bringing about obedience to the two rules that were laid down by our Heavenly Father.

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and all thy mind.

And:

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Isn't it presumptuous to assume that mere, puny humans, through a world parliament, can by edict or uncase accomplish that which God himself has not been able to accomplish in 2,000 years?

The only way to win the world to world brotherhood is by putting in effect those two divine commands. We can use the United Nations for education, for assuming the role not of Santa Claus, but the role of the good Samaritan.

I thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Thank you very much.

I am sure that no one can disagree with the statement that we need better humanity. In Washington we sense the need of it.

The President of the United States opens his Cabinet meetings with silent prayer, recognizing that man is inadequate.

Let us hear now from Henry S. Reuss, member of the Milwaukee County Democratic Party.

STATEMENT OF HENRY S. REUSS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The CHAIRMAN. Glad to see you.

Mr. REUSS. Glad to see you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Reuss and I had a little contest once, didn't we?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, we did. I am glad to see you again, though.

The CHAIRMAN. We are none the worse for it, are we?

Mr. REUSS. We certainly are not.

The CHAIRMAN. Carry on.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate being here, Senator Wiley and fellow Senators.

I represent the Democratic Party of Milwaukee County. We have approximately 3,000 members. In the last senatorial election in 1952, 260,000 democratic votes were cast, about 60 percent of the total.

Now, I am not going to suggest that each of the 260,000 people were personally consulted on this United Nations problem that we are considering this morning. However, we of the party have been aware of the purposes of the committee here today for some time, and we have discussed the problem at our local unit meetings, and the three points I want to make here briefly this morning have all been unanimously approved by the Milwaukee County Democrats in their county council assembly.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

First of all, we want to reaffirm our unwavering support of the United Nations Charter. I heard with interest the reference to the divine command, to love thy neighbor, and we think the best way to carry out that commandment in the world today is to give your militant and wholehearted support to the United Nations. [Applause.]

We oppose isolationism in all its forms. At home we oppose isolating Catholics from Protestants, from Jews, isolating one race from another, or isolating city people from country people, and in the world we oppose isolating ourselves from our freedom-loving allies, and even isolating ourselves from those with whom we don't agree.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you include in that management from labor, and vice versa? You do, don't you?

Mr. REUSS. Exactly; I certainly do. We think that this country was founded on the principles of brotherhood, and we think that has to be carried out today by assuming our international responsibilities.

VETO AND DISARMAMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

So much for generalities. We do have two specific suggestions for amending and improving the United Nations Charter.

In the first place, we believe that the veto power should be amended so as to prohibit its use to exclude new members of the United Nations. Russia has grossly abused the power under article 4. She has kept out numerous peace-loving countries, not the least of whom are such countries as Austria, Ceylon, Ireland, Finland, and Italy.

Secondly, we favor the setting up, as other speakers this morning have, on a high council type level of a permanent commission on disarmament and the peaceful use of atomic energy.

We keep an open mind as to other amendments. Those two, however, we feel are in the interest of a stronger United Nations, and we are prepared at this time to enforce them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment Mr. Reuss upon the clarity of his statement, as well as his brevity, and to assure him that we appreciate and understand what he has to say.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Henry, and I might say that in one of the very pleasant political encounters I had with him, we left as friends. We talked ideas and not personalities, and the result was that we could remain friends.

(The full prepared text of Mr. Reuss' statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY HENRY S. REUSS, MILWAUKEE, WIS., ON BEHALF OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

I appear here in behalf of the Democratic Party of Milwaukee County. The party is made up of members of local Democratic groups in every political subdivision of Milwaukee City and County. Of course, not all the 260,000 voters who voted Democratic in the Milwaukee County senatorial elections of 1952—the Democratic vote was 60 percent of the total—are formal members of the Democratic Party. But more than 3,000 Milwaukeean are active members, and help to form party policy. Representatives of these members meet monthly at the Democratic County Council. At the last meeting of the county council on March 26, 1954, the delegates unanimously approved the position of the D. N., which is presented here today.

The Democratic Party of Milwaukee County wants to express its unwavering support of the United Nations. We welcome the proposal to convene a conference to review the U. N. Charter with a view to possible improvement. But we should not like the possibility that the charter can be improved to weaken by one iota our wholehearted backing of the charter as it now stands.

As Democrats, we oppose isolationism in all its forms. Here at home, isolationism means isolating Catholic from Protestant, or white from colored, or city people from country people. In the world it means isolating ourselves from our freedom-loving allies abroad, and isolating ourselves from any contact with those with whom we do not agree. We oppose isolationism at all levels because we believe it is fundamentally contrary to the belief in the brotherhood of man on which this country was founded.

For this reason, we have long since determined that this Nation's great powers must not be dissipated by irresponsibility. To that end, we have consistently supported the U. N. Although the Intransigence of the Communist bloc has prevented the U. N. from realizing our highest hopes, we must never forget that it was the U. N. that stood up to world communism in Korea; it was the U. N. which furnished the forum for us to win the battle of the Berlin airlift; it was the U. N. that has held aloft the promise of a better life for millions of have-not people in the world.

Despite this solid record of achievement, there are at least two areas where—if they can be achieved—improvements in the charter seem possible. First, we favor limiting the power of Security Council members to veto well-qualified and peace-loving applicants for membership. The U. S. S. R. has abused this veto power by excluding nations which could make a valuable contribution to the U. N.—among them, Austria, Ceylon, Elre, Finland, and Italy. Second, we favor increased emphasis on the central problem of disarmament and the peaceful use of atomic energy by creating a special permanent U. N. Council to deal with these questions. There may be other worthwhile possible improvements to the U. N. Charter. On these, for the present, we keep an open mind.

There is no more fitting occasion than this coming 10th birthday of the U. N. for us to reaffirm in ringing terms our faith in the U. N. as the best hope of world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to call now on Mr. Bruno V. Bitker.

STATEMENT OF BRUNO V. BITKER, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. BITKER. Senator, I am Bruno V. Bitker, a Milwaukee attorney. I am also a member of the Mayor's Committee on Human Rights and Governor's Commission on Human Rights.

But I speak here for myself, and I hope I speak for man.

Prior to World War II, in the history of international governments and international law, the idea that human rights were a matter of international concern was wholly unknown to political science. These were matters with which solely the state alone was concerned.

But with World War II, the world speedily recognized the connection between the brutal treatment by a state of its own citizens, and the savage attacks upon other nations.

Unfortunately, the period since the close of the war has furnished no assurance that the treatment by the present dictatorships of their own nationals will not again lead to aggression against the rest of the world.

This is the midtwentieth century, and it is time to act. The League of Nations may have been the first faint realization that an international political entity was more than a dream, but even the League of Nations failed to recognize that human rights were a matter not of mere local interest, but of international concern. They were a matter of world peace.

Gen. George Marshall, while Secretary of State, when referring to the significance of international peace, of the obligation upon all nations to observe human rights, said:

Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other governments and other people, and are likely to seek their objectives to coercion and force in the international field.

IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE CHARTER

It was natural that this obvious connection between maintaining world peace and observing human rights should find expression in the charter of the new world organization. When the charter was drafted in San Francisco in 1945, and subsequently ratified by the Senate, its references to the recognition of human rights was so clear as to leave no doubt that human rights were within the province of the United Nations.

In fact, many of the delegates at San Francisco believed that an international bill of rights should have been written into the charter itself.

There are numerous references throughout the charter to this matter of human rights, all of which are set forth in detail in the formal statement which I have presented.

Incidentally, the charter starts out in its preamble with the following:

We, the peoples of the United Nations, * * *

Now, this has a familiar ring to Americans, because that is exactly the way our own Constitution starts out, "We the people."

Now, I do not cite our own Constitution as being the reason why, just because we use those words, it makes them right, but the fact is that because we have set up a framework in our own country from which the United Nations Charter is, in a sense, a following, that there is a special obligation upon the United States to further these principles of human rights within the family of nations.

When the then President of the United States addressed the closing session of the charter meeting in 1945, he said this:

Under this document (the charter) we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of International life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and freedoms, and unless we can attain these objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

FAILURE OF THE U. N. TO PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS

Now, unfortunately, the record since 1945 is not particularly encouraging, and in passing that, I would not minimize the work of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, nor could I forget that in Korea we did not fail, nor did we repeat the shameful performance of the League of Nations in Ethiopia, but on the vital obligation, the duty of protecting human rights, there has been a slow disintegration from the ideals with which we started in June 1945.

It is a fact that we have put in a great deal of time and energy into drafting a universal declaration of human rights. In fact, a

Genocide Covenant has been approved by the General Assembly, and has been adopted by the requisite number of nations to be effective as to the signatory nations.

But even this treaty, designed to prevent the systematic destruction of people on racial, religious, or cultural grounds, exists on paper only. It has yet to see the light of day in our own Senate.

Now, fortunately, the United Nations Charter has its own built-in retriever, and we are in a position to retrieve the loss since 1945 in this matter of furthering and implementing the matter of protecting human rights.

RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS

Now, obviously, it would be utopian to expect to spell out a covenant which would be acceptable to all member nations, but there are some principles which should and must be recognized if the goal of universal peace is to be approached.

These are the basic human rights which in some manner must become a world code of rights. They are simple and easily understood.

These fundamental rights encompass:

Freedom of speech and of press.

Freedom of religion and of worship.

Freedom of assembly.

Freedom of petition.

Freedom from unreasonable search and seizure.

Freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment.

And, above all, the right of every human being to share these freedoms equally with his fellow human beings, without regard to race, sex, language, or religion.

These rights are the clothing of dignity to every individual. It is unfortunate that Secretary of State Dulles found it necessary to announce that the United States would not now seek ratification of a Genocide Covenant or press for a final drafting of a human-rights covenant. Presumably he did this so as to appease the supporters of the Bricker amendment, which in great measure was aimed at the proposed treaty on human rights, but while Mr. Dulles paid the price of peace, the administration never got it, the administration was still forced to go through a prolonged fight, as the chairman of this committee well knows, against the Bricker proposals.

The CHAIRMAN. I have some recollection of that, sir. [Laughter.]

Mr. BITKER. I am sure you do.

I want to close by saying this, Senator Wiley, and fellow members of the committee:

SUPPORT FOR AN INTERNATIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Obviously, the adoption of an international bill of rights would not, for example, insure to an Iron Curtain national a fair jury trial. But then, thousands of years have passed since the Ten Commandments were handed down, and they are not yet universally observed. Their existence, nevertheless, has helped attain their objectives.

Our own Bill of Rights does not guarantee that our civil rights are not at times violated. But their inclusion in our Constitution gives them legal status, and our courts provide means of attainment.

So with an International Bill of Rights, these rights would then acquire the prestige of the Charter. The fact of their existence would sooner or later pierce national barriers. Even the great debate that might precede the adoption or rejection of such a program would itself be educational toward a worldwide recognition of these inherent rights of man.

The United States is in the unique historical position of having demonstrated, in a practical manner, the effectiveness of a Bill of Rights. We are under a moral obligation to lead the fight for the recognition of human rights everywhere. This is a means of attaining the goal of world peace.

I urge that upon this committee. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. [Applause.]

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Bitker is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF BRUNO V. BITKER, MILWAUKEE ATTORNEY AND MEMBER OF THE MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Prior to World War II, during the ponderous growth of international law, human rights were a matter of concern solely to the individual state. They were wholly domestic matters. But the ruthless denial of basic rights and the utter disregard of human life that were part of the Nazi practice suddenly assumed international significance. Not only was there a general revulsion at the inhumanity of the dictatorships, but the world speedily recognized the connection between the brutal treatment by a state of its own citizens and the savage attacks upon other nations.

Tragically, the period since the close of the war has furnished no assurance that the treatment by the present dictatorships of their own nationals will not again lead to aggression against the rest of the world. It is mid-20th century and long beyond the time to speak for man.

During the ages there has always been some who have attempted to establish, by force if need be, customs, rules, even laws which would deny basic rights to certain of their fellow humans. The same fight against the denial of these rights has been carried on by peoples as far apart in time and place as vedantic India, classical China, the early Jews, the first Christians, by Greece, Islam, medieval Europe, right down to our own time.

Through the years of history, written declarations of the rights of individuals as against each other, as well as against the state, have appeared and reappeared. Long before the United Nations had formalized a statement of principles, written declarations had appeared in one form or another in early Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in the British Magna Carta (1215), in the Habeas Corpus Act in England (1679), in the American Declaration of Independence, in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.

More recent declarations appear in such documents as the Atlantic Charter (August 1941); in the Chapultepec Conference Act (March 1945); the Convention adopted by the Council of Europe at Rome (November 1950); the statements adopted at various International Conferences of American States, including that adopted only a few weeks ago at Caracas.

The League of Nations may have been the first faint realization that an international political entity was more than a dream. But even the League of Nations failed to recognize that human rights were a matter not of mere local interest, but of international concern, a matter of world peace.

The failure of the League to provide international obligations for protection of human rights was thus described by Prof. Rene Cassin, the French delegate on the Human Right Commission. He said, in part:

"I was personally present at the dramatic debates which took place at Geneva between March and October 1933. At this time, the only way in which the criminal actions of Hitler Germany towards her own nationals could be brought to the notice of the Council of the League of Nations was to resort to the indirect procedure of invoking the Polish-German treaty on the protection of minorities concluded in 1922. On the day on which the Assembly dared to refer to the general principles authorizing the legally organized international community to protect human rights, even in a sphere not covered by some special minority

treaty, Hitler took advantage of the Third Reich's absolute sovereignty over its citizens and denied the League of Nations any right of inspection; and on October 14, 1933, Germany left the League. It is well known what attacks against the national independence and what massacres sprang from the impunity with which Hitler's first great crimes were committed."

It is little wonder that Gen. George Marshall, while Secretary of State, when referring to the significance to international peace of the obligation upon all states to observe human rights, commented that "governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other governments and other people and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field."

It was natural that this obvious connection between maintaining world peace and observing human rights should find expression in the charter of the new world organization. When the charter was drafted in San Francisco in 1945, and as subsequently ratified by the United States Senate, its references to the recognition of human rights was so clear as to leave no doubt that human rights were within the province of the United Nations. Many of the delegates at San Francisco believed an international bill of rights should have been written into the charter itself. But the controlling number of governments then felt that such provisions could be considered separately and adopted subsequently by way of an appendix to the charter.

A few references to the charter provisions will indicate how much a part of the charter of the new international entity was the idea of protecting human rights. At the outset, as a means of promoting peace in the world, the charter preamble asserts that "We, the people of the United Nations, determined * * * to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights in the equal rights of men and women * * * do hereby establish an international organization known as the United Nations."

To Americans this has a familiar ring. Our own Declaration of Independence says that "All men are created equal * * * that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights * * * [and] that to secure these rights Governments are instituted among men."

It is to secure these rights that governments are formed. And it is to secure these rights that the international organization, the United Nations, was formed. It is significant too, to note that the United Nations Charter says, "We, the peoples of the United Nations," not "We, the sovereign powers" or "We, the emperors," but, "We, the peoples." Again this is a familiar phrase to Americans. Our own Constitution opens with "We, the people * * *."

I do not cite our Declaration of Independence nor our own Constitution merely to assert that because we used these words, they must be right. I cite them only because our use of these words and our assertion of the ideals of the equality of man has had a great effect upon the world. It has placed upon us a special obligation to further these principles within the family of nations.

Again and again the charter speaks of human rights. The purpose clause (ch. I, art. I,) asserts that the United Nations is created to promote "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." The General Assembly (ch. IV, art. 13) is required to assist in the realization of these rights and freedoms and by articles 55 and 56 of chapter IX, each member nation is required to promote observance of these rights and freedoms. Indeed, the Economic and Social Council (ch. X, art. 68) is directed to set up appropriate commissions "for the promotion of human rights." This appears to be the sole provision in the charter requiring the establishment of a specific commission.

Little wonder then that the President of the United States, in June 1945, at the closing session at San Francisco said:

"Under this document (the charter) we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and freedoms, and unless we can attain these objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security."

Now what is the record since 1945? On the side of collective security the program has been surprisingly better than many of the early critics of the United Nations had prophesied. Nor would I minimize the numerous other functions successfully carried on by specialized agencies of the United Nations. Above all, I could not forget that in Korea we did not fail nor did we repent the

shameful performance of the League in Ethiopia. But on the vital obligation the duty of protecting human rights, the picture is one of slow disintegration from the proclamations and ideals of 1945.

During the first few years, considerable energy and time was devoted to bringing into being something akin to an international bill of rights, such as had been envisioned at San Francisco in June of 1945. It is true that a Universal Declaration of Human Rights emerged from the General Assembly in 1948. It is true, too, that a Genocide Covenant was finally approved and has since been adopted by the requisite number of nations to be effective as to the signatory nations. But even this treaty, designed to prevent the systematic destruction of people on racial, religious, or cultural grounds, exists on paper only. It has yet to see the light of day in our own Senate.

Political organizations at best are not eternal. Like manmade buildings, they can crumble with the passage of time. The United Nations will disintegrate someday. But ideas never die and perhaps we must settle for a mere declaration of principles instead of a series of formalized commandments. If nothing else comes out of this attempt to unite mankind, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will stand as the record that there were men of good will in this day who recognized these inherent rights.

There is little doubt that the very adoption of the universal declaration marked a step forward. But the 5 years since that event have been years of retrogression in protecting the most elementary of human rights. This is true not only of Iron Curtain countries, but in Asia, in the Middle East, in South Africa, even in parts of Latin America. It is obvious that the efforts to achieve genuinely binding obligations toward protecting the simplest human rights have become increasingly difficult.

Perhaps the moment of greatness passed with 1945. It may be too late in this chapter of world's history to retrieve that loss. Fortunately, however, the charter has its own built-in retriever. This is the provision for a general charter revision conference in 1955. This could be our chance to move forward from the point where San Francisco left off.

It would be utopian to expect to spell out a covenant which as of now would be acceptable to all member nations. But there are some principles which should and must be recognized if the goal of universal peace is to be approached. These are the basic human rights which in some manner must become a world code of rights. They are simple and easily understood.

These fundamental rights encompass: Freedom of speech and of press; freedom of religion and of worship; freedom of assembly; freedom of petition; freedom from unreasonable search and seizure; freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment; and, above all, the right of every human being to share these freedoms equally with his fellow human beings without regard to race, sex, language, or religion.

These are rights which human beings throughout the world have come to understand. They constitute the common denominator among all men upon the face of the earth. They come into existence with the birth of every man. They appertain to every man without regard to his nationality or color, or to the status of his parents or social beliefs, or to his store of or lack of knowledge. These rights are the clothing of dignity to every individual. Man now senses that he need not loathe himself because of his skin or submit to punishment or be denied basic rights by the fact of his birth.

When our Constitution was drafted in the early days of the new American Republic, it had neglected to spell out human rights. This defect was speedily cured with the almost simultaneous addition of the first 10 amendments, which we have come to know as the Bill of Rights.

Perhaps such an addition could be made to the charter. If nothing more, the rights so generally referred to, could be made more precise, be defined, even given names. If nothing more, the individual whose rights are violated should have the right of petition. If a judicial determination on a complaint through the International Court of Justice is now too visionary, perhaps some means of mediation could be established.

The failure to provide a means of receiving and acting on individual complaints, no matter how informally, is particularly disturbing. As the Secretary General of the United Nations reported, this defect in proceeding has brought, "disappointment and disillusionment to thousands of persons all over the world who, through the publicity activities (regarding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) have been led to believe that one purpose of the United Nations

in the achievement of cooperation in promoting and encouraging of universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

At the session of the Commission on Human Rights held at Geneva in April 1953, our Government retreated from leadership in drafting covenants. It announced its proposal for a new action program to consist primarily of studies relating to specific aspects of human rights and for annual reports of the status of these rights in local areas, with emphasis on education.

The Milwaukee Commission on Human Rights is cognizant of the great value of the educational processes. That the local commission has worked well in this field is evidenced by the attached letter from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge citing the Milwaukee commission's work as being "exactly what we have had in mind in putting forward our new action program" as announced by President Eisenhower in Geneva. The educational processes, of course, must be carried forward continuously.

It is unfortunate, however, that Secretary of State Dulles found it necessary to announce that the United States would not now seek ratification of the Genocide Covenant nor press for a final drafting of a Human Rights Covenant. Presumably he did so to appease the supporters of the Bricker amendment, which, in great measure, was aimed at the proposed treaties on human rights. But while Mr. Dulles paid the price of peace, the administration was forced nevertheless to go through a prolonged fight against the Bricker proposals.

Rules in some form must be adopted, recognized, and observed. The adoption of an international bill of rights would not, for example, insure to an Iron Curtain national a fair jury trial. But then thousands of years have passed since the Ten Commandments were handed down and they are not yet universally observed. Their existence nevertheless has helped attain their objectives. Our own Bill of Rights does not guarantee that our civil rights are not at times violated. But their inclusion in our Constitution gives them legal status and our courts provide the means of attainment. So with an international Bill of Rights. These rights would then acquire the prestige of the charter. The fact of their existence would sooner or later pierce national barriers. Even the great debate that might precede the adoption or rejection of such a program would itself be educational toward a worldwide recognition of these inherent rights of man.

The United States is in the unique historical position of having demonstrated in a practical manner the effectiveness of a Bill of Rights. We are under a moral obligation to lead the fight for the recognition of human rights everywhere. This is a means of attaining the goal of world peace. I urge consideration to the proposals outlined herein.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., May 27, 1953.

MR. BRUNO V. BITKER,

Chairman, Mayor's Commission on Human Rights,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. BITKER: Thank you for sending me a copy of the inspiring 1952 Annual Report of the Milwaukee Commission on Human Rights. The work you and your colleagues are doing in Milwaukee is making a real contribution to the effective protection of human rights which is an important part of President Eisenhower's program.

Such reports as this are an impressive demonstration of what free Americans can do to protect the rights of individual citizens.

This is exactly what we have had in mind in putting forward our new action program in the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva. It is a practical program designed to gather and make use of the experience of groups like yours to encourage and direct effective action in the field of human rights by voluntary effort.

You will find enclosed a transcript of the statement made by the Secretary of State before the Judicial Committee of the United States Senate which is the most concise statement of our Government's position on the matter of international treaties.

The Genocide Convention is no longer before us here at the United Nations. It is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and you should therefore make your views known to that body.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.

We will now hear from Mr. Llewelyn Pfrankuchen, of the department of political science, University of Wisconsin, who, by the way, is

a very good friend of our own Francis Wilcox, chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee who sits to my left.

Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF LLEWELYN PFANKUCHEN, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. PFANKUCHEN. Senator Wiley, members of the subcommittee, I am speaking as an individual, although I have been requested to appear by a number of individuals and groups from the United Nations Association, and the Wisconsin Council on World Affairs, a statewide organization.

I want to preface my formal statement with personal congratulations to the committee for its grassroots appearance in various parts of the United States, and particularly in Wisconsin. No person with whom I have talked has failed to express his gratification and approval of this method of bringing our foreign affairs directly to our people. [Applause.]

SUGGESTIONS ON THE CHARTER

I have a short statement of seven points, stating my personal position, which I will read:

1. If the present age of fear is to end, east-west tensions must be eased. Settlements of current hostilities, and of territorial, trade, and armaments questions, should proceed hand in hand with improvement of the United Nations.

2. The United Nations is in 1954 the principal human institution holding the free, the Communist, and the inbetween worlds together. As such it must be preserved, generously supported, and, if possible, improved.

3. The Conference to amend the charter should be held. Whether or not amendments result, such a conference will make clearer the role of the United Nations in an atom-armed world.

4. The present power of atomic, gas, and bacteriological weapons to destroy all civilizations and life requires that their manufacture and use be prohibited. The prohibition must be guaranteed by effective United Nations or world organs of administration, control, or inspection, which should later be extended to all armaments.

5. The Conference on United Nations Amendment should consider ways, acceptable to the members, of strengthening the structure and authority of the United Nations, including possible changes in:

a. The system by which states and peoples are represented.

b. The system of voting in United Nations organs, including the great-power veto.

c. The relative authority of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

d. The authority of the United Nations decisions in relation to member states.

e. The extension of United Nations authority to individuals within the states, particularly in the fields of atomic energy and armaments.

6. Member states (including the Soviet Union) should agree to channel economic aid to less developed countries more largely through the United Nations. Contributing countries will rightly insist on some proportionate share of control of funds they contribute, but this

need not prevent United Nations standards which assure that economic aid is not a mask for political domination.

7. The United Nations represent all the effective and peace-loving power in the world. No single state should be able either to (a) "shoot their way" in, or (b) blackball a proposed new member. The General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority, should admit new members.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir; thank you very much.

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question that is of tremendous importance to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Senator.

REVIEW CONFERENCE

Senator GILLETTE. I am not expecting you to answer it fully right now, but in view of the studies that you have made, I wish you would take it under consideration and perhaps file a statement of suggestions.

As is well known, the United Nations Charter provides after 10 years' experience—which is 1955—that the question of calling a conference on charter revision shall be placed on the agenda of the meeting in the year of the General Assembly, and the Conference shall be called, if it is supported by a majority of the General Assembly, and any seven members of the Security Council.

However, any changes that are recommended by the Conference, before they will go into effect or can go into effect, must be approved by and ratified by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations under their respective constitutional processes, and including all of the permanent members of the Security Council.

Now, that is a wall that the members of this subcommittee see very clearly, and if there are any suggestions by you or any of the other members that we can get in the State of Wisconsin, or the State of Iowa, or any other State, it would be very helpful to the committee.

Mr. FRANKUCHEN. Senator, I have considered that question, and I can give you my views on it briefly, right now.

Senator GILLETTE. Would we have time now, Mr. Chairman, or would it be better for him to submit it to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Can you do it in 2 minutes?

Mr. FRANKUCHEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Shoot.

Mr. FRANKUCHEN. I think that the conference should be held, and that the legislature should vote for holding it in the United Nations, and that the conference itself should decide upon the proposed amendments, and the conference should decide whether in case opposition develops in the Soviet Union, whether to submit amendments which will result in the Soviet Union leaving the United Nations or not.

I remember that the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States was called for the purpose of only amending the Articles of Confederation, and ended by proposing a new Constitution, which ultimately was accepted by all 13 of the then existing States, though some were reluctant and hung back.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We will now call upon Mrs. Sara R. Jones, State chairman, national defense, Daughters of the American Revolution, Marshfield, Wis.

Glad to see you, Sara.
Mrs. JONES. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SARA R. JONES, MARSHFIELD, WIS.

Mrs. JONES. First I want to commend this committee for bringing these hearings to the American people.

I think the interest in this auditorium is evidence that there is a great deal of interest by the people not only to testify, but to listen, and I congratulate this committee.

I want to preface my remarks by saying—

The CHAIRMAN. You have got 5 minutes. Get as much in as you can.

Mrs. JONES. Thank you, Senator.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

The American people have demonstrated that they are eager to cooperate with the United Nations in an effort to achieve international peace. However, we are not willing to accept peace at any price, and this price most definitely does not include setting up the United Nations as a world legislator, a world policeman, and a world taxgatherer. This is world government.

The best evidence that I can give you of the public opinion of the American people is that opposition to world government was written into the Appropriations Act of 1954. World government is not likely to come by sweeping amendments to the charter.

Senator Gillette has pointed out how difficult the charter is of amendment.

The greatest threat to American sovereignty is the gradual approach and, therefore, I want to comment briefly on two obstacles in the charter which are important to Americans.

CLARIFYING THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE

The first and most important of these is article 2, section 7, which states that:

Nothing in the present charter shall be construed as authority to intervene in purely domestic affairs.

It is extremely doubtful whether the charter would have been ratified by the Senate of the United States without that provision. It was originally assumed that it covered every article, chapter, and paragraph. In practice, it has not worked out that way.

This amendment should be clarified, and it should be made to extend to every provision in the charter.

It is a matter of record that ever since the United Nations began to function it has developed treaties, covenants, and pacts which have as their purpose the regulation of the domestic affairs of every nation on earth.

Furthermore, and I report it with regret, our own Government virtually abrogated any protection we might claim from this provision when it stated that there was no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs.

Our position was further weakened by the Attorney General of the United States, when he declared that articles 55 and 56 were obligatory.

The American Association of United Nations takes the extreme viewpoint that articles 55 and 56, which deal in the social-economic field, are not qualified by article II, section 7. Now it was just such statements as these which gave rise to the demand for the Bricker amendment, and I want to point out that it is not only the American people who are concerned, but other member nations have expressed misgivings about the treatment or misuse of this clause. One such is the representative from the Union of South Africa, Mr. G. P. Jooste, and he said, and I quote:

The United Nations has, at the instance of a voting majority, consistently intervened in matters in which it is enjoined by the charter not to intrude. My Government welcomes the growing evidence that this urge to intervene in the domestic affairs of member states is causing widespread concern. This evidence comes from the most responsible sources, both inside and outside the organization, and it would be well to heed the warnings of those who realize that, if the United Nations is to survive as an instrument of peace, this dangerous course of intervening in the domestic affairs of states will have to cease.

NO WEAKENING OF THE VETO

The next point, and I think it very briefly concerns the veto:

We have heard a great deal about it this morning, but I want to point out that it represents a safeguard for America. The charter cannot be amended without our consent, so long as the veto stands.

As for admission of members to the United Nations, we now find ourselves in the position of requiring that veto, or in order to prevent the early seating of Red China, and I would like to point out that the seating of Red China is the No. 1 objective of the Communists today.

In conclusion, I would like to remind this committee that the phrase, "Strengthen the United Nations," is a euphemism for "turn it into a world government."

The position of the Daughters of the American Revolution is that our national sovereignty is essential to the preservation of our constitutional republic, and the continuing freedom of the American people.

We are an island of freedom in this unhappy world, and while we stand strong, all the world can hope for ultimate delivery from tyranny. Our freedom is based on our independence, and our successful resistance to all powerful government.

Thank you, gentlemen, for this privilege and honor. I leave our constitutional republic under your loyal protection.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Sara. I want you to take my regards to Bob and his wife, and your folks.

Mrs. JONES. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

The CHAIRMAN. And tell them that this time we got along very, very well.

Mrs. JONES. All right.

(The full text of Mrs. Jones' prepared statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY MRS. HENRY S. JONES, STATE CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, WISCONSIN SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. Chairman: I am here in my capacity as State chairman of national defense, Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. Our national society is an organization having a membership of over 171,000 members and

some 2,737 chapters. The objectives of the society are patriotic, historic, and educational.

The 62d Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, passed a resolution which opposed turning the United Nations into some form of world government.

"Whereas the United Nations Charter was adopted upon the thesis that members would retain their national sovereignty and rights as free and independent nations and would not 'intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State'; and

"Whereas some of the agencies of the United Nations have initiated courses of action which threaten the Constitution of the United States and conflict with Federal and State laws; and

"Whereas the Charter of the United Nations comes up for revision in 1955 and world government proponents are already zealously working to achieve their aim of 'strengthening' the charter to provide for world government or partial world government;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, maintain its stand that the United Nations should be a deliberative body of sovereign nations working together for the 'adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace';

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reiterate its opposition to the Genocide Convention, Covenant on Human Rights and all other United Nations agencies or treaties which would have the effect of superseding our Constitution or limiting our national and State liberties or freedoms;

Resolved, That we again voice our strong disapproval of any attempt to bring about through the United Nations or any other medium a world government or partial world government."

The Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention this year, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the United Nations Charter will come up for revision in 1955; and

"Whereas the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has reaffirmed its previous stand of maintaining the intent of the U. N. Charter in its original form—"As a parliament of sovereign nations working together to bring about a lasting peace;"

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as opposing any revision or amendments which will enable the U. N. organization to usurp any part of the individual sovereignty of member nations or lead to any form of world government."

These resolutions speak for themselves. The Daughters of the American Revolution have opposed in the past, and will continue to oppose in the future, all efforts to convert the United Nations into any form of world government. I would remind this committee that we entered the United Nations as a sovereign nation in an assembly of sovereign nations, and I most earnestly urge this committee to accept no recommendations which might impair the sovereignty of this Republic.

Our country has been eager to cooperate with the United Nations in an effort to achieve international peace. However, the American people are not willing to accept peace at any price. "Give me liberty or give me death" is still a statement of principle for not only the American people, but for many other peoples as well, and this thought is so stated in the "Review of the United Nations Charter."

Despite this, we can expect the threat of the hydrogen bomb to be used as a sort of Med Piper's tune to urge us to extensive surrender of national sovereignty. The point is not made clear as to what—other than national suicide—would be accomplished, since such a surrender would neither reconcile the opposing ideologies within the U. N., nor offer assurance that the Soviet Union would stop the arms race or agree to inspection of her atomic and hydrogen weapons.

WORLD GOVERNMENT

We are already deluged with propaganda which asserts that, "A system of world law must precede world disarmament." But when it develops that "world law" includes turning the United Nations into a world government from which there would be no escape; would destroy our immigration laws; urges legislative

¹ Review of United Nations Charter, Document 87, 85d Cong., 2d sess., p. 811.

powers over individuals as well as nations; would ultimately deny us sufficient armed forces even for our own defense; seeks the "power to raise revenue for U. N. purposes"; such revenue to be levied "proportionate to national income";¹ and urges authority to "maintain United Nations armed services sufficient—to support the United Nations civilian police wherever necessary";² then every American has the right and duty to inquire whether these proposals for "world law" or world government are not actually blueprints for our destruction, rather than our security.

On November 8, 1949, the New York Journal American carried a blistering editorial on just such proposals as I have outlined. It asked: "How can Members of the United States Congress, sworn to defend the American Constitution, listen with respectful complacency to these outrageous proposals that they enact laws for America's destruction?" It added, "It is time for the American people to intervene and make it plain that they still cherish the free America their forefathers created for them."

Here I am proud to state that the Daughters of the American Revolution have made it plain that they "cherish free America." Our organization has worked with other patriotic organizations, warning of the dangers implicit in any form of world government. Today, of the 23 State legislatures which once passed world government resolutions, 21 have rescinded their actions; 2 States have resolutions opposing any form of world government, and 7 more have refused to take affirmative action.

Even more important, because it reflects public opinion in this country, opposition to world government was written into the appropriations act of 1954 by the 83d Congress. It states: "None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used to: (1) pay the United States contribution to any international organization which engages in direct or indirect promotion of the principle or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship; and (2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principles or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship."³

If world government should come, it is not likely to be accomplished by sweeping and immediate amendments to the charter. At this point, it will be difficult to make any amendments in the charter because of the divergent viewpoints of the five permanent members of the Security Council, whose approval is required before an amendment can be effective. The real threat to American sovereignty lies in the gradual approach to some form of world government.

Meanwhile, we can be certain that at least two provisions of the charter will come under scrutiny, namely, the veto power and article 2, section 7.

VETO

In the present world political climate, it would be dangerous for the United States to surrender the veto. It should be noted that the veto offers one of our greatest safeguards, since the charter, as presently written, cannot be amended without our approval.

It must be acknowledged that the Soviet Union has abused the veto in two fields, namely, in matters concerning peaceful settlement of disputes, and in admission of States to membership. This has drawn legitimate fire.

However, abuse of the veto in efforts to obtain peaceful settlement of disputes has been largely inhibited by the "Uniting for Peace" resolution, which authorizes the General Assembly to act when the Security Council cannot or will not. Incidentally, this resolution provides a precedent for bypassing the Security Council on other matters, and strengthening the General Assembly, where there is no veto. This possible trend bears watching.

As for surrendering the veto on the specific matter of admission to membership, we now find ourselves in the position of requiring the veto to prevent the early seating of Red China in the United Nations. Despite this, our country may well offer to surrender this particular power, because it has been so freely abused by the Soviet Union. It is by no means certain that the Soviet Union will agree to such surrender, and for once will serve this country well if she takes such a position.

¹ Second London Conference of Parliamentary Conference on World Government.

² Sixth General Assembly of United World Federalists, June 21, 1952.

³ Public Law 195, 83d Cong., 1st sess., p. 6.

ARTICLE 2, SECTION 7

A battle over article 2, section 7, is already shaping up. This article stipulates that nothing contained in the present charter "shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of any State." This provision has been violated more consistently than any other article, and it is certain that some of the member nations will seek clarification.

Without this provision, it is extremely doubtful whether the charter would have been ratified by not only our own Senate but many of the member nations. It was originally assumed that the provision applied to every chapter, article, and paragraph of the charter. In practice it has not worked out that way.

It is a matter of record that ever since the United Nations began to function as an organization, it has been a perfect hatchery for treaties, covenants, and pacts which have as their purpose the regulation of the domestic affairs of every nation on earth.

Furthermore, our own Government virtually abrogated any protection we might claim from this clause when the State Department asserted: "There is no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs" (Publication 3972). Our position was further weakened when the Attorney General of the United States stated that articles 55 and 56 of the charter, which pertain to social, economic, and other "essentially domestic" fields, were obligatory. He qualified his statement by adding that articles 55 and 56 were non self-executing.¹ However, even this construction authorizes Congress to legislate in fields not otherwise permitted by the Constitution.

The American Association for the United Nations goes even farther. In an *amicus curiae* brief, filed in the Supreme Court, it insisted that "the obligations of the United States under articles 55 and 56 are not qualified by article 2, paragraph 7 thereof."²

It was just such statements as these which gave impetus to the demand for the Bricker amendment. Furthermore, the American people are not the only ones to express concern. I would like to call your attention to the complaint offered by another member nation. Mr. G. P. Jooste, of the Union of South Africa, commented:

"The United Nations has, at the instance of a voting majority, consistently intervened in matters in which it is enjoined by the charter not to intrude. . . . My government welcomes the growing evidence that this urge to intervene in the domestic affairs of member states is causing widespread concern. This evidence comes from the most responsible sources, both inside and outside the Organization, and it would be well to heed the warnings of those who realize that, if the United Nations is to survive as an instrument of peace, this dangerous course of intervening in the domestic affairs of States will have to cease."³

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would remind this committee that the phrase, "strengthen the United Nations," is a euphemism for "turn it into a world government." The position of the Daughters of the American Revolution is that our national sovereignty is essential to the preservation of our Constitutional Republic and the continuing freedom of the American people. We are an island of freedom in this unhappy world, and while we stand strong, all the world can hope for ultimate delivery from tyranny. Our freedom is based on our independence, and our successful resistance to all powerful government.

Thank you, gentlemen, for this privilege and honor. I leave our Constitutional Republic under your loyal protection.

The CHAIRMAN. There was one statement that I think I will have to clarify. It was said that the United Nations was a hatchery for treaties.

There is so much misunderstanding in that direction. One time someone said there were 200 of them when as a matter of fact there were some 6 or 7. We cannot get into the pros and cons too much on the facts, or misstatements of facts. What we want are the sugges-

¹ Hearings, S. J. Res. 1 and 43, p. 922.

² Hearings, S. J. Res. 1 and 43, p. 680.

³ Review of United Nations Charter, Document 87, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 185.

tions, and we have had some very valuable suggestions. I want to thank everyone who participated.

We now have Mr. Christ T. Seraphim of Milwaukee, speaking for himself.

Glad to see you, sir.

Mr. SERAPHIM. Glad to see you, sir. I will take only a minute and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. People have been converted in less time, sir.

Mr. SERAPHIM. Yes.

STATEMENT OF CHRIST T. SERAPHIM, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. SERAPHIM. I am speaking for myself, as you stated; I don't even presume to speak for my wife.

The CHAIRMAN. What a man!

Mr. SERAPHIM. It is a privilege, Senator, to appear before this committee, and I appreciate it, as a citizen, this vital role that you and your colleagues are playing in bringing this committee before the citizens of Milwaukee and Wisconsin, so that you might hear their statements.

I think, as Senator Gillette said earlier, and one of the other speakers, that the United Nations is the cornerstone of United States foreign policy. I believe that it would be tragic if the United States were to withdraw, or in any way participate to weaken the United Nations.

Reference was made earlier to God, as if God was not on the side of peace. I think God is on the side of peace, and although God might not have been able to achieve peace, I think that we, the little peoples of the world, who seek food and shelter, and a guaranty of some future for their families, I believe that through this association of free nations, and even the nations that are not with us, I believe they may be like wet paint, some of this freedom we love, some of the decency and dignity that we wish to achieve, might rub off, and I think that we should continue to participate in the United Nations.

REVISING THE VETO ON MEMBERSHIP AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT

I think that we should insist that the revision conference be held. I think there should be two specific revisions, and they have been stated by previous witnesses.

No. 1 is the elimination of the veto on the admission of new members.

Secondly, the elimination of the veto in the pacific settlement of disputes.

As to the reasons given, I underwrite the reasons given by previous speakers.

I thank you very much, Senator. I wish to thank also Senator Mansfield who has contributed immensely to strengthening the United Nations and the free world.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

I will now call on Mr. Verne P. Kaub, president of the American Council of Christian Laymen.

Before Mr. Kaub continues, I might say, if I can just take a moment, that we are going to have a little extra time this morning.

If there is anyone here who wanted to be heard or file a statement, I would be glad to have them bring them up, and it will facilitate our work for this afternoon session.

I might say that two of my associates have to leave in the latter part of the afternoon, and I will be here conducting the meeting alone and try to finish up the entire job.

If any of you have statements that you want to file, instead of being heard in the few moments that will be allotted to you, it will facilitate the hearing, and your statements will be printed in full in the record.

Thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Kaub, we will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF VERNE P. KAUB, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. KATN. It is my studied opinion, based upon what I know of the words and deeds of others of like mind as well as upon my own thinking, that Bible-believing American Christians must oppose all moves in the direction of world government, these including proposals to limit or abandon the veto power in United Nations and other measures designed to give United Nations authority over the lives and destinies of people of all nations.

SAFEGUARDING AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

The purported objectives of United Nations, insofar as they relate to extension of human rights, safe from war or threat of war, are fine and noble, and have the approval of all Christians. But United Nations seek to bring about this worldwide Utopia through enforceable agreements about trade rights, national boundaries, and atom bombs. All this is folly. Agreements mean nothing to dictators and politicians who know no God.

Even more important, freedom is not a material thing, and it cannot be attained by manipulation of material things. Freedom is a spiritual concept, and is attainable here on earth only if and when man-made laws are brought into harmony with God's laws.

I love America not so much because our Nation is the richest and most powerful in the world, but because it is the land of freedom. Our Nation is at once the greatest and freest nation because it was founded on Christian principles. The American heritage of freedom is the hope of the world only because it is a Christian heritage. This is a modern statement of the greatest of truths: From the beginning of time Christ has been the hope of the world.

When Thomas Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence it was the first time in history that man had written into a political document cardinal principles of the Christian faith, the importance and dignity of individual, and the equality of men before the law and in the sight of their Creator. Later, the Founders wrote the Constitution to be the enabling document and give reality to the Christian concept of human freedom.

The founders, writing the Constitution, cast aside every shred of the Old World's cringing adherence to statism, accepting without reservations the Christian concept of sovereignty of the individual.

Every other nation has had this same opportunity to pave the way to freedom, but not one has cared or dared to take final leave of materialism and risk all to gain freedom by giving free rein to God's laws.

So, America alone holds the Christian heritage of freedom, which will be finally, utterly lost if it is melted down with the dross of Old World statism, materials, and atheism. Only if America stands firm as one nation unafraid to lift aloft God's banner of truth and justice, inviting reluctant nations to stand with her, can this Christian heritage be saved for future generations.

Fallacies of Collective Security

Collective security never was more than a dream, and an evil one at that, really a nightmare. We cannot forget what happened in Korea, what is happening in Indochina, what happened only a few years ago under the same management which set up United Nations, when the pretendedly free nations sold all Central Europe, from Berlin east, into abject slavery.

Representatives of great organizations of Protestant churches will appear—have appeared on similar occasions—to argue for collective security, claiming it can be attained by application of the principles of the universal brotherhood of man. In Christianity there is no universal brotherhood, but only the brotherhood of followers of Christ.

Pretending to speak with the voice of a united Protestantism, the National Council of Churches ceaselessly supports that greatest of facilities, collective security. The real truth is that the National Council has only a partial right to speak for no more than 36 percent of American Protestants, and not even a shadow of right to speak for 64 percent of the Protestants of our Nation.

Complete documentation of this declaration is contained in the leaflet titled, "The National Council Speaks—for Whom?", which is a publication of American Council of Christian Laymen. A copy of this leaflet is submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States with request that it be made a part of the record of this present hearing.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir, very much.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES SPEAKS—FOR WHOM?

COUNCIL'S OWN STATISTICAL REPORTS SHOW THAT NCC REPRESENTS ONLY 36 PERCENT OF AMERICAN PROTESTANTS

When the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA speaks—and it speaks vigorously and often on a wide variety of subjects, mostly political—it ignores the fact that it has no shadow of right to speak for at least 33 million of the 52 million Protestant church members in America.

Rather, NCC makes it clear, when it speaks, that it wants listeners to believe they are hearing the voice of a united Protestantism.

Spokesmen for NCC have various ways of persuading the public that its pronouncements are worthy of universal respect because of the numerical strength of its constituency.

An example is found in an official NCC press release, bearing the name of Donald C. Bolles, the Council's director of public relations and editor of "Na-

tional Council Outlook." This release was prepared for use at the biennial convention at Denver in December 1952; it states:

"The National Council includes virtually all the major denominations (Southern Baptists and Missouri Synod Lutherans excepted). It embraces 29 constituent or member communions; 143,068 local churches; 122,769 pastors with charges and 83,809,988 members."

Actually, of 20 Lutheran bodies, only 3, with member rolls totaling 2,400,810, are NCC affiliates; 17 nonaffiliated bodies have 3,387,344 members. Thus, less than 40 percent of American Lutherans are members of NCC affiliates.

Among Baptist churches, 3 of the larger conventions and 1 of the smallest, with a total of 8,074,155 members, are NCC affiliates. Eighteen nonaffiliated groups have 8,307,700 members. Only slightly more than 51 percent of American Baptists can be called NCC affiliates.

When examining NCC's claim that it embraces 33,809,988 members, a first step must be recognition that this number includes 564,300 communicants of Eastern Orthodox churches which are not Protestant.¹ Subtracting this number, we find that NCC claims to represent 33,245,488 Protestants.

The accompanying tabulation (on inside pages of this leaflet) is adapted from a tabulation appearing in the NCC publication, "Information Service," for September 6, 1952. The NCC tabulation includes only church bodies of 50,000 or more members each.

To be perfectly fair to NCC, the adapted tabulation include five NCC affiliates which have less than this number of members. Names of these smaller denominations are designated with a preceding asterisk (*). Membership counts for these groups are taken from Handbook of Denominations in the United States by Frank S. Mead, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press (the Methodist Publishing House), 1951.

For purposes of this presentation, member counts for bodies not affiliated with NCC are placed in column 1, and affiliates in column 2.

CLAIM NOT SUBSTANTIATED

Total membership count for NCC affiliates, appearing at bottom of column 2, is 30,723,037, a number 2,520,451 short of the NCC claimed total of 33,245,488 Protestant members. Much more important discrepancies will appear as this presentation develops. (Affiliates are 58.9 percent of the total.)

Membership counts of named nonaffiliates, appearing in column 1, total 17,933,097. However, this number is only a subtotal. To find the true total of Protestants who are members of nonaffiliates, the number 3,502,298 must be added to this subtotal, bringing the total of nonaffiliates to 21,437,395. The added number, 3,502,298, represents members of smaller nonaffiliated denominations.²

With nonaffiliates numbering 21,437,396, and NCC affiliates totalling 30,723,037, it is clear that NCC has no shadow of claim to authority as representative or spokesman for 41 percent of American Protestants.

As the next step toward determining the validity of NCC's claims of speaking for American Protestantism, members of affiliates are separated into two classifications. Member counts placed in column 3 are of church bodies having congregational polity; in column 4 are placed membership counts of church bodies with corporate structure and Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopal polity.

¹ Eastern Orthodox Churches affiliated with NCC, and their membership counts, are: Romanian Orthodox Church, 50,000; Russian Orthodox Church in North America, 490,000; Syrian Orthodox Church, 75,000; and Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 39,500. Member counts for the first three named are from a statistical table appearing in the NCC publication, Information Service, for September 6, 1952. This tabulation includes only member counts for denominations of 50,000 or more members each. The membership figure for the Ukrainian Church is from Handbook of Denominations.

All membership figures in the Information Service tabulation are from Yearbook of American Churches, 1952, a publication of the NCC, edited by Benson F. Landis, associate executive director of the Central Department of Research and Survey.

² As indicated in the accompanying (adapted) tabulation, the figure 3,502,298 represents the number of Protestants who are members of other Protestant bodies not NCC affiliates, these being denominations of less than 50,000 members. This figure was arrived at by adding the subtotal in column 1, or 17,933,097, to the total of NCC affiliate members, and subtracting this total from the total number of Protestant Church members in the Nation, given as 52,162,432, in the same issue of Information Service in which the tabulation appears. A proving or checking addition appears at bottom of column 2.

Protestant Church membership in the United States—Continued

(Tabulation below is adapted from tabulation in Information Service, official publication of National Council of Churches, for Sept. 6, 1932, showing membership in all religious bodies of 50,000 or more members each)

	Nonaffiliates of National Council of Churches	Affiliates of National Council of Churches of Christ		
			Congrega- tional in polity	Episcopal or Presbyterian in polity
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Seventh Day Adventists	245,974			
Assemblies of God	315,478			
Baptist bodies:				
American Baptist Convention		1,354,304		
Southern Baptist Convention	7,373,496			
National Baptist Convention of United States of America, Inc.		4,467,779		
National Baptist Convention of America		2,645,739		
American Baptist Association	296,601			
Free Will Baptists	401,000			
General Baptists	50,487			
National Baptist Evangelical Life and Soul Saving Assembly	57,674			
National Primitive Baptist Convention of United States of America	79,000			
Primitive Baptists	72,009			
Seventh Day Baptists		6,363		
United American Free Will Baptist Church	78,350			
(Subtotals, Baptist bodies)	(6,397,700)	(8,674,165)	(8,674,158)	
Church of the Brethren		186,356	186,356	
Christ Unity Science Church	82,172			
Christian and Missionary Alliance	63,935			
Churches of God:				
Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God	75,000			
Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.)	121,796			
Church of God (Anderson, Ind.)	100,874			
The Church of God	54,360			
Church of God in Christ	328,365			
(Subtotal, Churches of God)	(676,395)			
Churches of the Nazarene	258,678			
Churches of Christ	1,000,000			
Congregational Christian Churches		1,241,477	1,241,477	
Disciples of Christ		1,792,965	1,792,965	
Evangelical and Reformed Church		735,941		735,941
Evangelical United Brethren		720,544		720,544
Federated Churches	88,411			
Friends:				
Religious Society of Friends (5 Years Meeting)		68,618		
*Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity		19,016		
(Subtotal, Friends)		(87,635)		(87,635)
Independent Fundamental Churches of Amer- ica:				
International Church of the Four-Square Gospel	65,000			
	64,109			
Latter Day Saints (Mormons):				
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	1,111,314			
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	126,453			
(Subtotal, Latter Day Saints)	(1,237,767)			
Lutheran:				
American Lutheran Conference:				
American Lutheran Church	715,640			
Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church		463,063		
Evangelical Lutheran Church	825,456			
Lutheran Free Church	59,800			
*Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church		19,048		

See footnotes at end of table.

Protestant Church membership in the United States—Continued

(Tabulation below is adapted from tabulation in Information Service, official publication of National Council of Churches, for Sept. 8, 1952, showing membership in all religious bodies of 50,000 or more members each.)

	Nonsaffiliates of National Council of Churches	Affiliates of National Council of Churches of Christ		
			Congrega- tional in polity	Episcopal or Presbyterial in polity
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Lutheran—Continued				
Lutheran Synodical Conference of NA;				
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod	1,674,901			
Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of				
Wisconsin and other States	311,477			
United Lutheran Church in America		1,923,506		
(Subtotals, Lutheran bodies)	(3,587,344)	(2,409,616)		(2,409,616)
Mennonite Church	58,330			
Methodist bodies:				
African Methodist Episcopal Church		1,166,301		
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church		728,150		
Colored Methodist Episcopal Church		352,167		
The Methodist Church		9,055,727		
(Subtotal, Methodist bodies)		(11,352,345)		(11,352,345)
Pentecostal assemblies:				
Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, Inc.	50,000			
United Pentecostal Church	100,000			
(Subtotal, Pentecostal assemblies)	(150,000)			
Polish National Catholic Church	265,879			
Presbyterian bodies:				
Cumberland Presbyterian Church	81,096			
Presbyterian Church in the United States		702,266		
Presbyterian Church in the United States		2,364,112		
of America		219,027		
United Presbyterian Church of NA				
(Subtotals, Presbyterian bodies)	(81,096)	(3,285,405)		(3,285,405)
Reformed bodies:				
Christian Reformed Church	155,310			
Reformed Church in America		167,256		167,256
Salvation Army	227,821			
Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of				
America	51,850			
International General Assembly of Spiritualists	150,000			
Unitarian Churches	79,901			
Universalist Church of America	63,975			
*Moravian Church (North and South Prov-				
inces)		46,327		46,327
*Evangelical Unity, Czech Moravian Brethren				
in NA		5,000		5,000
(Subtotal, members of nonsaffiliates)	(17,935,087)			
Members of other Protestant bodies not Na-				
tional Council of Churches affiliates	3,562,298			
	21,477,385	30,725,037	11,694,975	18,633,092
		(21,417,395)		(11,991,875)
		(52,142,432)		(30,725,037)

* Five Protestant denominations affiliated with National Council of Churches have less than 50,000 members each, and are added to the table as published in Information Service described in caption above. These membership statistics are from Handbook of Denominations in the United States, by Frank S. Mead, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1951.

† This number is found by subtracting from the total of Protestant Church membership the sum of members of National Council of Churches affiliates and the subtotal of members of nonsaffiliated denominations with 50,000 or more members each.

‡ This addition is made to prove correctness of classification of communicants as members of National Council of Churches affiliates and nonsaffiliates.

§ This addition is made to prove correctness of classification of members of National Council of Churches affiliates as communicants of churches with congregational polity and of churches with Episcopal or Presbyterian polity.

Admittedly, corporate church bodies have ecclesiastical authority over their local churches, and hence have at least some right to speak for the members, or, by joining some such federation as NCC, may transfer to that body the authority to speak for individual members.

This situation does not and cannot apply in the case of church bodies with congregational polity. For example, each and every local Congregational Christian Church is a complete, wholly autonomous ecclesiastical unit.

Local churches of the Congregational Christian fellowship federate in area associations, state or regional conferences, and, on the highest level, the General Conference. But neither association, conference, nor the General Council has ecclesiastical or other authority over local churches, and hence no authority whatever to speak for churches or members.

An illusive and tenuous affiliation of Congregational Christian Churches with NCC results from the fact that the General Council has joined NCC.

VOICE LACKS AUTHORITY

But since the General Council has no power or authority to speak for churches or members of the fellowship, it cannot transfer any such authority to the National Council or any other body.

Exactly this same situation as to congregational polity exists also among the churches of the Baptist group, Church of the Brethren, and International Convention of Disciples of Christ.²

Membership of these (pretended) NCC affiliates totals 11,804,975, which is the figure at bottom of Column 3 of our adapted tabulation.

When member counts of these noncorporate, congregational churches were placed in column 3, there remained for placing in column 4 only membership counts of NCC Protestant affiliates totaling 18,850,002. This is the number of Protestant church members for whom NCC can claim some right to speak. This number is a far cry, indeed, from the NCC claim of right to speak for more than 33 million church members.

Sum of the total of member counts of nonaffiliates of NCC, 21,437,295, and the membership counts of pretended affiliates in churches of congregational polity, 11,804,975, is 33,332,370, which is the number of Protestant Church members for whom NCC has no right to speak. The number is 64 percent of the number of Protestants in the Nation, according to NCC's statistics.³

Moreover, NCC speaks for the remaining 36 percent of American Protestant church members only over loudly voiced protests of many of the men and women in this minority.

From hundreds of pulpits of churches rebellious declarations are heard. The brave preachers in these pulpits are of every affiliated denomination. Some of them have begun the publication of periodicals of protest. Others have dared to join, as individuals, the National Association of Evangelicals, which is openly anti-NCC. Organizations of laymen are formed or forming in many of the denominations, and interdenominational organizations are adding their protests.

Even within NCC's own organization, rebellion raises its voice. A laymen's committee organized to sponsor the constituting convention at Cleveland in the late fall of 1950 refused to disband, as was desired and directed by the ruling hierarchy, but continued its opposition to leftist pronouncements of the Council, and gained recognition of United Church Men, an NCC department.

The National Council of Churches speaks for only a minority of American Protestants, and even within this minority both groups and individuals voice loud and vehement opposition to the Council's political pronouncements.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now call Mr. John Fritschler, lawyer, of Milwaukee.

Glad to have you, sir.

Mr. FRITSCHLER. Thank you, sir.

² The book, *Handbook of Denominations*, is one authority for statements in this paragraph. On p. 64 of this book will be found official statement of the General Council of Congregational Christian Churches relative to effects of congregational polity as it applies to that fellowship.

³ The percentage would be slightly larger if the NCC count of Protestants were correct; the NCC total, 52,162,432, does not include either Jehovah's Witnesses or Church of Christ, Scientist, a total of not less than a million. Neither of these groups will report the number of their members.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. FRITSCHLER, JR., MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. FRITSCHLER. Senator Wiley, gentlemen of the committee, and guests, it is indeed good that you could set hearing on this matter in the State of Wisconsin. Here we take our politics seriously and give a lot of thought to the destiny of our Nation. Too often we of the Midwest are not consulted and our voice is not heard. We are glad you are here and hope that our opinions will be of value to you.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE UNITED NATIONS

This last weekend I had the privilege of serving as parliamentarian to the Midwest Federation of College Republican Clubs at their annual convention at LaFayette, Ind. There were gathered students from 35 colleges and universities in the 12 Midwest States. I learned much. They are young men and women who have their eye on the problem and looking hard for the solution. They believe we should support the United Nations and seek to improve the efficiency of its operations, but they also believe that the United Nations has failed in its main objective—the preservation of the peace. They believe that member nations should contribute financially to its support on a basis proportional to their national income.

NO SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY

However, we must be on our guard. We must not by design or inattention give up the sovereignty of the United States. A strong United States is the last and best hope for the preservation of the world. Remember the statement by John P. Humphrey, then Director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations:

What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationship between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens.

It became a part of our constitutional law that any powers not specifically granted to the Republic automatically remained in the hands of the separate States, or in the hands of the people themselves.

STRENGTHENING THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE

It is important, as legislators, that you remember this. Article 2 of the United Nations Charter provides that—

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state * * *.

This is supposed to hold true for the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, and the Commission on Human Rights. The American people have faith in their legislators, and you must be vigilant. You have no Bricker amendment to protect you.

Article 2 must be amended or reinterpreted. We have seen the effects. The California courts have already held that since the charter

is a treaty and inasmuch as it provides for racial equality, mixed marriages are now legal, the laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding. The question of whether or not mixed marriages are good is not at issue, the question is whether powers of the State were usurped contrary to the 10th amendment. The United States Department of State has said:

There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

The position that—

Few acts of a nation affect only its own people—its own domestic jurisdiction. Apparently the United Nations can deal with national actions which are essentially of concern to other nations—

has been taken much too often to suit many of us in the Midwest. We value our liberty and don't want a committee of the General Assembly in Wisconsin telling us how to solve our problems. The United Nations now has the power to do this and thus we feel that article 2 must be reworded to preserve our domestic sovereignty.

I would like to quote from the late Senator Robert A. Taft. He must not be forgotten because he was right:

The test is: Is the subject one on which the people of the United States would be willing to have other nations interfere with our internal actions?

PLACING JUSTICE IN THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The charter must be made to recognize the meaning of "justice." It speaks of "maintain[ing] peace and security" but without the consideration of justice except in a minor way at the insistence of the late Senator Vandenberg.

Peace and security are not synonymous with justice. It might well be that the Security Council, acting in full compliance with the charter could take property from one nation to which it justly belongs and give it to another, because it felt that would promote peace.

This is the rule of expediency and the rule of ungoverned men. The United States is a Government of law and not of men. The United Nations should use the same rule.

THE UNITED NATION AS A PROPAGANDA FORUM

The next question should be to recognize the value of the United Nations. We must realize that primary value is in providing an international propaganda forum.

In June of 1945 when the United Nations was formed, there were less than 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Now there are more than 800 million.

If we continue to lose the propaganda battle, all else we gain will amount to nothing.

However, the basic weakness of the United Nations is not this. It is that resolutions no matter how well intentioned do not make peace. England, Iran, Egypt, and France, Morocco are just examples of this. Russia violated article 5 of the principles in the Korean war. And does the United States have the power to declare war under article 1 of the Constitution? The charter gives this power to the Security Council.

KEEPING THE VETO

It has been suggested that we eliminate the veto power from the United Nations because of the abuse by the U. S. S. R. This cannot be done. It must not be done. In an organization operating by expediency rather than by law, we cannot be sure that public opinion will always be with us. If not, our financial burden in supporting the United Nations, over one-third of the world total, can be used against us. A good example was when the Assembly Economic Committee voted 31 to 1 against us in approving the right to nationalize industry at any time without compensating foreign inventors. Surely here public opinion was against us. We must have our veto.

The one consideration I wish to leave with you gentlemen is this: Keep the United States strong. Do not give up our sovereignty; we are the last and best hope for world peace.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions?

Senator MANFIELD. Yes, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Senator MANFIELD. I enjoyed listening to your testimony, but I cannot say that I agree with too much of it. What I wanted to say, though, is this: There have been references several times this morning to the Bricker amendment.

As one who opposed the Bricker amendment, but who fought for and worked hard for the George amendment, I want to take this occasion, as a Democrat, and as a member of this committee, to pay my tribute to that distinguished chairman who carried the fight in behalf of the President of the United States against the Bricker amendment. [Demonstration.]

I notice here, that as in the Senate, and as in my home State, there is a marked difference of opinion. That is all to the good because when we cannot have differences of opinion in this country we are on the way out and down.

I want to say this: That, so far as the Bricker amendment is concerned, I think we ought to get down on our knees and thank God that we have the kind of men who wrote into the Constitution the things they did relative to the treaty-making power, and if you cannot trust two-thirds of the Senate to pass on a treaty, then you cannot trust the American people, and it is up to the Senate to get going on the job. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have order, please.

Mr. FRITSCHLER. In answer to the Senator's question, I would like to congratulate him for supporting the George amendment. I am sorry that he did not see the same way that a lot of us in the Middle West felt—that the rights of Americans must be protected in view of the problems with international organization. I am sorry he could not find it in his conscience to support the Bricker amendment.

Senator MANFIELD. May I say this: That under the Constitution, the Founding Fathers who wrote that document placed in the Senate the responsibility, by a two-thirds vote, of passing a treaty, or by a one-third of knocking it down.

Insofar as the George amendment is concerned, it applies only to executive agreements, and there is no reference to the executive agreement in the Constitution, hence my reason for supporting that, because I think there should be a sharp division in responsibility and power between the Executive and the legislative.

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to enter into this controversy—

The CHAIRMAN. Neither do I at this time.

Senator GILLETTE (continuing). But I happen to be a Democrat, and a Member of the Senate, who did not see eye to eye at all times with reference to the Bricker amendment, as did my colleagues. But I want to say with reference to the chairman here that the fight he put up and the argument he put up was magnificent. He was not quite persuasive enough in this case to influence me, but he was so persuasive that he induced me to vote for the St. Lawrence waterway when I was opposed to it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think this is pretty well staged, and I certainly appreciate my associates.

I want to ask Mr. H. W. Ihrig to come forward. He was scheduled to be heard this morning, and I am very happy to see you, Mr. Ihrig. You may make your statement.

STATEMENT OF H. W. IHRIG, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. IHRIG. My name is William Ihrig. I am an attorney in Milwaukee. I had expected to come in this afternoon, and I would like to have the privilege to file my statement this afternoon, so I will just summarize it now. Relative to the matter of the problem involved in the Bricker amendment, as it relates to the imaginations and to the treaty-making power, I wanted to call the attention of the audience to the action of Senator Ferguson in saying that a large part, or in pointing out that a large part of the misunderstanding over that whole problem was because all of the international agreements and presidential agreements were, and without the consent of Congress had not been fully understood, and that if the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate and the House did have the benefit, and the press had the benefit of summary statements of all those agreements, nothing would slip by, considering the service that we get from those two committees.

But it does seem that if the Congress would strengthen the permanent staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee, so that they had an enlarged staff, and an enlarged appropriation, so that all of these agreements which are a part of the United Nations filing system, which are a part of the United Nations Department of State activities, which are brought into question, that we would not have the problem presented to us, as it was in this last session of Congress, that there was a matter of vital concern.

If the American public, and if the American Congress obtained the information of what is in those international agreements, I am sure that Congress will represent the interests of the American people, without needing a constitutional amendment for that purpose.

SEMI-PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL.

With regard to the proposed amendment of the United Nations Charter, I wish to ask the committee to consider a major change in regard to the Security Council. With the Security Council consisting of 5 permanent members, and 6 nonpermanent members, I believe they should recommend to the State Department to carry on negotiations with the other permanent members who have the veto power, that a new class of semipermanent members on the Security Council should be created.

I believe that at least 10 countries which would be considered great powers, or could be considered great powers in the world, ought to help carry the ball, instead of the American taxpayer doing it, that they ought to be given the power to carry the ball, and to carry their share of the expense by being placed on the Security Council.

I can think of the problem of the Security Council calling for armed forces, calling for aid in the enforcement of the decisions of the Security Council, but usually the Security Council represents a contest between two opposing camps, lead by the United States and Great Britain on one side, and Russia on the other.

It does seem to me that if the other great powers, such as India, Pakistan, Israel, Japan, Germany, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, were added to a classification of semipermanent members of the Security Council, but of a class that would, say, serve for 10 years, and of a class, say, that would be able to replace themselves, not as the nonpermanent members are, where they have to alternate and cannot succeed themselves.

It does appear to me that if this group of semipermanent powers was added to the Security Council, and they represented that problem that the United States has, of having befriended their neighbors and the persons in the area with it, because of a war going to arise or that might arise, or the presence of allies might deter somebody from commencing, that if you had these powers on the Security Council, with a right to succeed themselves, but for a 10-year term, and not having the veto power, that you would contribute materially to the United States having some help in carrying its share of the load.

Now, I have no illusions, I think the United States paid the cost of the entire Second World War in order to obtain the United Nations organization. I think it was a remarkable accomplishment in getting it as complete as it is, even to discuss the problems of all the phases of the world that might lead to war, and I believe that if the defeated nations, like Japan and Germany, would be added to the Security Council, but not with a veto power—if India, Pakistan, and Israel were added, but not with a veto power—if the two basic powers of South America, Argentina and Brazil were added, but not with the veto power—if Poland and Czechoslovakia were added, the problems that are confronting us that might make war, on whether there is a Poland after Russia moves out, or whether she is or is not going to move out will lead to war. Where is the boundary line going to be between Poland and Germany? That has still been left unsettled.

Or whether negotiations that were carried on, that that was only temporary to give Russia security, because Hitler had devastated that great area of 200 miles, and destroyed all the industrial might, so that Russia was weak at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir; thank you.

We will have to close. We have a dinner engagement and some of these Senators are very faint.

We are going to put your statement into the record when you give it to us this afternoon. We thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. LURIE. Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Now, let me say that if there is anyone here who has a statement, if you will bring it forward, we will file it in the record.

We will now stand in adjournment until 2 o'clock when we will then resume our hearing.

(Whereupon at 12:20 p. m., Saturday, April 10, 1954, the hearing was recessed to 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Present: Senators Wiley (chairman), Gillette, and Mansfield.)

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order, please.

Mr. Lawrence F. Giese, representing the Wisconsin Committee on United Nations Charter Review.

Mr. Giese, we will ask all of you if you can stick within the 5-minute limit, because we have, as I see here, some 37 or 38 witnesses listed, and if you prefer to give the high points of your own convictions as to what should be or should not be done, we would appreciate it, and we will file your statement, or we will print the entire statement, just as you desire.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE F. GIESE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. GIESE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be here representing my group. Incidentally, Senator Wiley, the news release said, "sixty-odd witnesses." So I am one of the "odd" witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of witness?

Mr. GIESE. Odd witness.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing odd about you. You look like a good fellow to me. Go ahead.

Mr. GIESE. My name is Lawrence F. Giese. My vocation is that of an application engineer. I am testifying as the chairman of the Wisconsin Committee on U. N. Charter Review and as an individual.

The Wisconsin Committee on U. N. Charter Review, which is sponsored by the Milwaukee Peace Education Committee, has its roots in the Gillette resolution, Senate Resolution 126; which authorized a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the U. N. Charter Review to secure grassroots opinion relative to the U. N. Charter and provision to report to the Senate and to the President prior to January 31, 1955. Our committee was conceived as the result of appeals from Senator Wiley and Secretary of State Dulles to public and private organizations to study and evaluate the U. N. Charter.

The Wisconsin Committee on U. N. Charter Review with representatives of churches and leading concerned organizations was organized to stimulate grassroots thinking with respect to the political, economic, and humanitarian aspects of the U. N. Charter.

BASIC SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

Basically, the committee believes in and supports the United Nations as an organization and its constructive activities. The committee is aware of the fact that the United Nations is not perfect and that it was conceived under abnormal conditions and that it has made mistakes, but it likewise recognizes that the U. N. is a practical project and that it has great potentialities for securing and maintaining world order and a world of peace and plenty. To accomplish these objectives, the United Nations must be made more effective in those areas.

WORK OF THE WISCONSIN COMMITTEE ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER
REVIEW

Because of the composition of the committee, it cannot endorse any particular point of view as to how the U. N. can be made more effective. Viewpoints of the representative organizations range all the way from status quo to international law. Between these two limits are various degrees of opinion such as a more liberal interpretation of the charter, operation within the spirit of the charter, more effective use of its present provisions and of a review of the charter.

To provide for impartial discussion, it has conducted 2 full-day seminars, 1 on January 9, 1954, and the other on April 3, 1954, with viewpoints presented from position of status quo through to world law adequate to eliminate war and to enforce peace. The seminar held on January 9 was the first of its type in the Nation to discuss U. N. Charter review in accordance with objectives of Senate Resolution 126.

A total of over 600 people from all walks of life from numerous cities throughout Wisconsin, from high schools and colleges, from churches and concerned organizations attended the seminars. Repeated encouragement was given to individuals and organizations to give further thought and study for their organizations and communities. Speakers were furnished, literature, information, and guidance were given in response to numerous requests.

On this very day, as the Senate Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Review holds its hearings in Milwaukee, it is significant that the great majority of those testifying on a rational and constructive basis and who are presenting testimony vary in content, emphasis and degree are those who attended the seminars on U. N. Charter review within the past 3 years, or who had direct or indirect contact with the committee through correspondence, discussion, or publicity. The Wisconsin Committee on U. N. Charter Review is grateful to have had the privilege, the honor and opportunity to be of service to the Senate Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Review.

The Wisconsin Committee on U. N. Charter Review hopes that the testimony of the people throughout Wisconsin that has been given as the result of the committee's activities will be of great value to your committee in preparing its report to the Senate and to the President.

The committee will continue to function through additional seminars, through publicity, and through other avenues of learning. It will do so especially in light of the advent and terrors of the H-bomb, the mass destructive capabilities of the C-bomb, and the paralyzing effects and results of the bacteriological and lethal warfare which

make the H-bomb mild and human in comparison. All of these events are accelerating a serious interest in, a deep concern over, and a widespread awareness of the most crucial situation which has ever faced the world.

As further possibilities are explored, as opinions change and as new solutions are made evident, your committee will be advised by individuals, by organizations, or by our committee. It is the intention of our committee to use the testimony that had been presented today as a basis for further discussion of U. N. Charter review.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND A PERMANENT DISARMAMENTS COMMISSION

Personally, and I now speak as an individual, I believe that armaments must be universally reduced to a minimum for the conservation of resources and for the conservation and continuance of the human race.

I believe there must be some enforceable type of international law if we are to have world order, a world of permanent peace, and a world free from the thoughts of the horror and inhuman results of atomic, lethal, and bacteriological warfare.

I believe that the U. N. Disarmament Commission should be made a permanent commission. There should be included on the committee, a representative from the World Health Organization as the nature of future warfare will influence and affect the health and existence of practically every person on the globe.

Because of the immensity and intensity of the armaments race, because of the rapid advances of weapon development and the complicated scientific fundamentals of atomic energy, I recommend that the U. N. Disarmament Commission have three subcommittees, one dealing with conventional arms, another dealing with atomic and atomic-related bombs, and the other with lethal and bacteriological weapons.

It is difficult to conceive of a world of order, harmony, peace and plenty without universal membership in the U. N. or without modification of the veto so that no one nation can directly or indirectly impose its will upon the world through the voluntary choice of the veto.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. Carl Romanik, president of the Business and Professional Women's Club.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CARL ROMANIK, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. ROMANIK. Mr. Wiley and members of the subcommittee, the Business and Professional Women's Club of Milwaukee, with a membership of 250, are very grateful for this opportunity to reaffirm our support of the United Nations.

Strengthening and making effective the United Nations has been an item on our national legislative platform since 1948 and on our local program long before that because we realized that a peaceful world is essential to the advancement of all people as well as to the advancement of business and professional women.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISIONS

Very briefly, we favor universality of membership because it is consistent with the purposes of the United Nations and in the best interest of world peace.

We favor the removal of the veto in matters of procedural nature in the Security Council.

We believe that any review of the United Nations Charter should recognize the great hope that lies in the work of the Economic and Social Council, its commissions and agencies, particularly the Human Rights Commission and the specialized agencies.

The great contributions of technical assistance and trusteeship should be recognized. We believe efforts should be put forth to make the United Nations more the chief instrument of our foreign policy. Finally, we favor giving the Disarmament Committee a status of an organ in the United Nations on par with the Economic and Social Council and Trusteeship Council instead of a committee in the Security Council as provided in article 29.

I thank you for this opportunity of talking to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Romanik.

(The full prepared statement of Mrs. Romanik is as follows:)

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 10, 1954.

United States Senate Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter:

The Business and Professional Women's Club of Milwaukee, with a membership of 250, are grateful for the opportunity afforded by this hearing to reaffirm our support of the United Nations.

This support does not imply endorsement of all its policies or programs but implies a conviction that the United Nations must be maintained and strengthened as the instrument for peace and for settling international differences.

Believing that the following three great principles and aims of the United Nations are interrelated and interdependent and that only through a thorough exploration of each of these can "peace for all nations and well-being for all men" be achieved:

1. To save succeeding generations from the threat of war.
2. To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person.

3. To promote social progress and better standards of life.

Therefore, we believe that any review of the United Nations Charter should recognize the great hope that lies in the work of the Economic and Social Council, its commissions and agencies. The great contributions of the technical assistance and trusteeship should be recognized. We believe article 71 has been very valuable because it offers opportunity for nongovernmental agencies to observe the work of the United Nations, to interpret it to the people and to bring information and points of view to the United Nations.

We believe efforts should be put forth to make the United Nations more the chief instrument of our foreign policy and would like to urge the United States to refrain from unilateral actions as far as possible.

We believe in universality of membership which is consistent with the purposes of the United Nations and in the best interests of world peace.

We favor the removal of the veto in matters of a procedural nature in the Security Council.

We favor giving the Disarmament Committee a status of an organ in the United Nations on par with the Economic and Social Council and Trusteeship Council, instead of a committee in the Security Council, as provided in article 29.

Respectfully,

ERMA ROMANIK,
Mrs. CARL ROMANIK, President.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Raymond B. Spurlock, representing the peace committee of the Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Church.

Friends of Wisconsin, one of my very dear friends, the distinguished Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, has to leave us. I want you to give him a hand. [Applause.]

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you so much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Spurlock.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND B. SPURLOCK, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. SPURLOCK. Senator Wiley, and members of the Senate subcommittee, my name is Raymond B. Spurlock, and I am pastor of the First Methodist Church of Fort Atkinson, Wis., the dairy capitol of the world. I serve also as chairman of the peace committee of our Wisconsin Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, which conference lists something over 67,000 members on its rolls. I do not represent that committee as far as any action they have taken. I am simply chairman of that committee, and I am speaking for myself.

By virtue of my office in our annual conference, and my very personal interest in world peace, I dare to give my witness before you this day. It is my understanding that the committee desires to learn something of how the people back home, near the grassroots of living, are thinking in regard to the United Nations and the possible strengthening of certain powers by such revision and adjustment as will make those powers more effective in maintaining the peace of the world.

Gentlemen, I need not tell you that we are sick of wars and rumors of wars. My crowd went out in 1917-18 to make the world safe for democracy and to end war. We won the war but the statesmen lost the peace. In 1941 another generation of youth went out to fight another war to rid the world of the tyranny of totalitarianism, and the brutal sadism of depraved leaders whose only god was the god of Mars and might wrapped up in one. Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and their supporters were defeated and sent to a dismal death. Our youth won the decision and it is up to the statesmen to whom they have flung the torch of freedom to see to it that that torch is kept burning by conserving the ground already gained through the United Nations organization, and by doing whatever is needed to make it more effective in establishing a just and lasting peace in the future.

STRENGTHENING THE U. N.

I stand firmly behind the position my church took at the last general conference when convened in San Francisco in May 1952 when they said:

Peace can come only from God, expressed through all peoples. World peace is bigger than any single nation, single economic system, or single religion. The United Nations, if peace is to be achieved, must be developed into a world federation of nations. To insure such investment of national sovereignty as will lay the foundation for permanent world cooperation and peace, we must first have the wider recognition and acceptance of God as sovereign over all nations. We call for revision of the United Nations Charter in such manner as to enable that body to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war.

That position was adopted by the duly elected delegates representing some 15 million Methodist churchmen throughout the world. I

would reaffirm this position and state further that since the dissemination of knowledge concerning the H-bomb and its awful destruction, we who not only love our own country, but are concerned for the welfare and security of all other nations as well, believe that our own security is made most sure when the security of all is established under law. This would make desirable, universal membership in the United Nations, and necessitate a well established governmental body probably patterned after our own with legislative, executive, and judicial houses. This, in turn, would require some form of equitable representation from the member nations, also an international police force to see that whatever laws were enacted be carried out among the nations.

I would, therefore, not only encourage, but urge you and all others who are our representatives in government and who have the responsibility of our foreign policy, to take immediate steps in whatever direction is needed to revise the United Nations Charter to enable that body to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war.

This is no time to be talking about getting the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States. Such a position rather than preserving our sovereignty is relinquishing it to a competitive armament race that dictates our economics, our politics, our foreign policy, and will ultimately limit our freedom to servitude and slavery.

To you who are schooled in national and international jurisprudence I say make haste to strengthen the arm of the United Nations that these nations under God shall have a new birth of freedom from fear and destruction, from atomic fission, and that government of the nations, by the nations, and for the nations shall not perish from the earth.

Thank you for this privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Walter T. Norlin, Washburn, Wis.

STATEMENT OF WALTER T. NORLIN, WASHBURN, WIS.

Mr. NORLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is Walter T. Norlin. I am district attorney of Bayfield County, Wis., and have been for 16 years. I am chairman of the Bayfield County Red Cross, a past post commander of the VFW, a past district officer in the 10th district of the VFW, a member of the United World Federalist, and of the Atlantic Union Committee.

The witness who spoke before me expressed my ideas on the matter of giving the United Nations lawmaking and law-enforcement powers. Assuming that the committee will be interested in the reactions that have been noted by witnesses to discussions on the subject, I should like to say that since my return from service in World War II, I have discussed this subject of giving the United Nations lawmaking and law-enforcement powers before scores of groups in north Wisconsin. These groups range in size from a dozen to several hundred. As to types, they are PTA's, church groups, business organizations, and service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, American Legion, VFW posts and others. They have been of all ages and levels of education. My theme has generally been the same.

WORLD LAW AND ITS ENFORCEMENT

After pointing out the need for law and the institutions of government on the local government level, using myself as district attorney as an example, I pointed out the need for law to maintain order on other levels, tracing the development of our Federal Government from the Declaration of Independence through the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution and Bill of Rights. I then pointed out that we are in the same stage of organization on the world level under the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights as we were on the national level before the Constitutional Convention.

I have found that the average person has no difficulty whatever in understanding these basic principles, and I have met, and I hope to overcome, in many instances at least, the usual opposition and objections that the United States would have to surrender too much of its sovereignty, that we would pay the lion's share of the cost, that immigration barriers would be lowered eventually, and that in any event, it would be useless for us to advocate giving lawmaking and law-enforcement powers to the United Nations as other peoples are not ready for such a change in the world organization.

I would like to say in my opinion we have been going too long on the matter of what other peoples will do. I think we ought to advocate what we want in the world and then say, "This we will have, and beyond this no one else ought to want to go."

CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD THE U. N.

The committee may be interested in another indication of what other people are thinking about the United Nations as presently constituted at the grassroot levels. Six or seven years ago, advocacy of world federation was often interpreted as criticism of the United Nations as now constituted. Many people were so optimistic about the promise that the United Nations would furnish the machinery for keeping the world at peace that they resented having anyone suggest that it could not do the job. Since the war in Korea, there has been a noticeable change in this attitude among my audiences; not always in the direction of seeing the need for more authority in the United Nations. Some of these people have now become cynical and would support a movement to get the United States out of the United Nations entirely.

A federalist speaker now quite often finds himself defending the United Nations and pointing out the accomplishments of its special agencies, and seeking to justify its very existence, where, a few years ago it was taken for granted that we had to move forward toward greater and greater participation in international affairs.

My experience in this regard leads me to believe that unless bold and imaginative action to strengthen the United Nations is recommended soon, there will be a continually increasing reaction toward total withdrawal by the United States from the United Nations.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the alternative if we go out? [Applause.]

Mr. NORLIN. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the alternative supposing that we do?

Mr. NORLIN. We are opposed to our going out.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that.

Mr. NORLIN. The people I have talked to do not propose any alternative. They simply are isolationists and want to get out because they feel it is not doing and cannot do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had any suggestions in case we step out of the United Nations as to what we should do?

Mr. NORLIN. No; no one seems to have thought about that. The reaction is simply against the United Nations largely because of the war in Korea and the feeling that it is involving us and is the standard isolationist viewpoint of 15 or 20 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. How many counties have you talked in?

Mr. NORLIN. In Bayfield, Ashland, Price County, Douglas County, and up in Duluth, Minn., before businessmen's groups there.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. NORLIN. I want to thank you for the opportunity of coming here. I do not speak for the organizations that I mentioned. I appear as an individual interested only in furthering the cause of world peace and the preservation of liberty. I thank you again for the opportunity. It is encouraging to see Senators working Saturday afternoons in the cause. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Just one moment. After that remark, I have to ask two questions. One, evidently the personnel of the organization you said you were a member of differs in its views.

You have now expressed one view and today certain gentlemen from the VFW and also the American Legion seem to have had convictions which you do not seem to agree on. Is that true, generally, in your organization?

Mr. NORLIN. In the part of the VFW, for example, that I belong to in the 10th district, and where I have been a district officer, the subject has really never been debated whatever. The information—the literature has come out from the so-called American Sovereignty Committee. It is read in book fashion and there has never been any honest debate or discussion except in the posts where I have brought it up.

The CHAIRMAN. As to Senators working Saturday afternoons, that is about the only time we get the chance to work outside of Washington. The rest of the time, including Sundays, we work in Washington. When we can get out like this we are working in the suburbs, so to speak.

Mr. NORLIN. I am sure we all appreciate your coming here. Thank you and God bless you. [Applause.]

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Norlin is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WALTER T. NORLIN, WASHBURN, WIS.

With all due respect to, and acknowledgment of, the good that has been done by the U. N. through its special agencies and commissions, I assume that what we are most concerned with is the ability of the organization to maintain world order without war. The most serious criticism of the U. N. is that since it is an organization of completely sovereign and independent nations, each maintaining large military establishments, every attempt to enforce its resolutions or decrees on offending members involves the threat of war. There seems to be no escape from the principle stated by Alexander Hamilton 166 years ago.

"In an association where the general authority is confined to the collective bodies of the communities that compose it, every breach of the laws must involve a state of war; and military execution must become the only instrument of civil obedience."

That this truth is applicable to the U. N. is attested to by the war in Korea, from which it is apparent that far from providing a substitute for war as an instrumentality for settling international disputes, the U. N. has been obliged to itself engage in war; and Mr. Dulles was quoted in the press as having said in October 1950, "The action of the U. N. in Korea provides the pattern for success of the organization in the future." [Emphasis supplied.] On principle, it is apparent that the basic weakness of the U. N. is its league structure and the fact that it lacks lawmaking and law-enforcement powers. The question of course is whether we have reached a sufficient stage of development of the world community so that it is now practical to advocate the far-reaching changes in the U. N. Charter which would give the organization those powers. Those who believe that we have not reached that stage will recommend only minor and superficial changes in the U. N. Charter. Those who feel the people are ready for organization of the world under law, will advocate more basic changes.

Assuming that the committee will be interested in the reactions that have been noted by witnesses to discussions on the subject, I should like to say that since my return from service in World War II, I have discussed the subject of giving the U. N. lawmaking and law-enforcement powers before scores of groups in north Wisconsin. These groups range in size from a dozen to several hundred. As to type, they have been PTA's, church groups, business organizations, and service clubs, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, American Legion, and VFW posts and others. They have been of all ages and levels of education. My theme has generally been the same: After pointing out the obvious need for law and the institutions of Government on the local levels, I have pointed out the need for law to maintain order on other levels, tracing the development of our Federal Government from the Declaration of Independence in 1776, through the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution and Bill of Rights. I have then pointed out that we are in the same stage of organization on the world level under the U. N. Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights as we were on the national level before the Constitutional Convention. I have found that the average person has no difficulty whatever in understanding these basic principles. I have met the usual oppositions and objections—that the United States would have to surrender too much of its sovereignty; that we would pay the lion's share of the cost; that immigration barriers would be lowered; and that in any event it would be useless for us to urge giving lawmaking and law-enforcement powers to the United Nations as other peoples are not ready for such a change in the world organization. Notwithstanding this type of opposition, I believe from my experience before these groups and from discussions with typical individual citizens, that most of our people, either consciously or intuitively, sense the need for giving the U. N. broader powers and will give overwhelming support to recommendations looking toward that objective.

The committee may be interested in another indication of what our people are thinking about the U. N. as presently constituted. Six or seven years ago, advocacy of world federation was often interpreted as criticism of the U. N. and many people were so optimistic about the promise that the U. N. would furnish the machinery for keeping the world at peace that they resented having anyone suggest that it could not do the job. Since the war in Korea there has been a very noticeable change in this attitude: not always in the direction, however, of seeing the need for more authority in the U. N. Some of these people have now become cynical and would support a movement to get the United States out of the United Nations entirely. A federalist speaker now quite often finds himself defending the United Nations and pointing out the accomplishments of its special agencies, and seeking to justify its very existence, where a few years ago it was taken for granted that we had to move forward toward greater and greater participation in international affairs. My experience in this regard leads me to believe that unless bold and imaginative action to strengthen the U. N. is recommended soon, there will be a continually increasing reaction toward total withdrawal from the United Nations. I cannot honestly say that in my opinion, based on my contacts with what I believe to be a very representative cross section of American citizenry, a recommendation by the Senate of the United States for basic changes in the U. N. Charter would receive universal acceptance or immediate support from a majority, but I am firmly and sincerely convinced that it would not be very long before such support would be forthcoming. Those of us who have been leading public thought in the direction of order through law on the international level, have gone as far as we can at this time. Unless our representatives will take the lead and give us something specific behind which to rally support, I believe we must resign ourselves to marking time until after the next

war has given further impetus to the drive to substitute, as Hamilton would say, "the mild and salutary influence of the magistracy for the violent and destructive coercion of the sword."

The CHAIRMAN. Arnold Goodman, Wisconsin branch of the United World Federalists, Milwaukee, Wis.

Carry on.

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD GOODMAN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. GOODMAN. I would like to preface my remarks with a few statements.

I am not in favor of any authority for the United Nations which would interfere with domestic jurisdiction of the member states. I am not in favor of the tyranny of dictatorship on the world level. I am not in favor of the lessening of the rights of individuals in this or any other country. I oppose interference with any nation's form of government, economic system, flag, constitution, religion, or culture. I am for the raising of the standard around which the wise can rally. The event is in the hands of God.

I represent the Wisconsin branch of the United World Federalists, having about 450 members in 10 Wisconsin cities, and I have been asked to present a point of view regarding the revision of the United Nations Charter. I am a businessman engaged in property management and insurance.

While we hurtle toward atomic annihilation with ram-jet speed, we cannot assume a turtle's pace in establishing world institutions to restrict this means of destruction. We must move rapidly in keeping with our times or fail in our responsibility.

STRENGTHENING THE U. N.

We must seize upon the Charter Review Conference to fundamentally strengthen the United Nations. Experimental, tentative, superficial changes in the charter will not rectify the basic fault in the charter, which is the inability to enforce the decisions of the General Assembly. Finding a solution to the problem of the veto, admission of countries to the United Nations, and problems of trusteeship areas is an exercise in temporary symptomatic relief. We must revise the fundamental cause of such problems by the establishment of a system of enforceable world law. The primary area in which such law should be enacted is in international control of atomic energy and of other arms.

ENACTMENT OF WORLD LAW

The conference should be devoted to providing the United Nations with the authority or power to declare war a crime. Such authority must have the force of law and law must be the foundation of the United Nations strength. We believe that the United Nations should be given the right to enact, enforce, and interpret world law regarding the control of arms. The United Nations should have the power to define what war is by statute, to enforce penalties upon anyone who violates that law, and to have a compulsory system of courts to settle and mediate disputes of international character. It is this

system of governmental authority which maintains peace upon every level of living except on an international level. It is this basic authority which the United Nations now lacks.

There are obviously risks in the proposition but the alternative is an ever-mounting and uncontrolled arms race that will sap the vitality and wealth of our great Nation. If the authority I have described were carefully given, limited in nature, defined, checked, and balanced, we could be secure from the scourge of war. We would lose only our sovereign right to declare war and then only on a condition that the United Nations could keep us secure.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission is now meeting to discuss the meaning of international control of arms and arrive at a plan for worldwide disarmament under foolproof safeguards. We believe this effort to be extremely important. However successful the ultimate plan might be, it must take the form of world law and as such be enforceable by the independent means of the United Nations organization itself.

Taming the power of jealous nations is not an easy task, but we believe that the United Nations alone is the instrument through which it can and must be done. The affirmative acts of heroic creations in this regard will make the charter review conference an inspiration to peoples everywhere.

Thank you, gentlemen, very much. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Goodman.

Mrs. August C. Backus, Jr., representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Milwaukee, Wis. Glad to see you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. AUGUST C. BACKUS, JR., MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. BACKUS. I am very happy to be here, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

The Milwaukee branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom is the group that I represent here this afternoon. We are particularly gratified to be here and to see this assemblage because it is a group that has worked for 40 years to bring to the public attention the necessity for all of us to concern ourselves with the world outside of our own borders.

REVIEW CONFERENCE BACKED

Our organization backs the conference and urges that the United States support the calling of a general conference for the revision of the United Nations Charter. We feel that there is, again, a genuine opportunity to put the world on the road to peace. We feel that if the men who drew the charter in 1945, had possessed the wisdom and the insight to implement the high purpose to which that document was dedicated that we might now be traveling on the road to peace.

As in the case of our own Articles of Confederation, in the charter as now drawn, the interdependence of States was insufficiently recognized and the delegation of that portion of sovereignty which would be adequate to establish world order, based on law, was assiduously avoided. The solid basis on which our own Government rests was made possible, we believe, because the men who drew our Constitution proceeded in the body of the document to make practical provisions for carrying out the moral purpose as set forth in the preamble.

AN IMPARTIAL WORLD LAW BASED ON MORALITY

Specifically on the matter and import of world law, we recommend the serious consideration of the fact that law, impartially drawn and justly administered, is the only alternative to force, internationally, as it is in the affairs of the individual state.

We suggest that the plan for the codification of international law and the proposal of new conventions, which the Chinese delegation submitted to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, be used as a guide for revision of the charter in this area. Those proposals referred to in the Chinese memorandum have excellent basic suggestions, in our estimation, in that area.

We deem it essential that the word "aggression" be defined in law, with attention to the political and economic as well as the physical or military aspects of this crime.

It should be here noted for the benefit of those persons who are frightened, some to the point of hysteria at the thought of any law standing above the law of our land, that what is proposed here is that we bind ourselves to acknowledged universal moral law. The individual citizen who is without desire to murder or assault his neighbor does not feel that his sovereignty is impaired or his freedom abridged by the law which defines and prohibits these acts. Why, then, should our Nation, which abhors aggression and exploitation, hesitate to subscribe to law, on an international level, which is confined to safeguarding the integrity of the individual states? It is our firm conviction that a legal code which clearly defines the rights and obligations of national governments and provides protection for those areas of the world which are now moving toward self-government is the indispensable foundation for world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we ask you to put the balance of your statement in the record now?

Mrs. BACKUS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very grateful to you, but we must hurry on with this large assemblage.

Mrs. BACKUS. All right. [Applause.]

(The statement of Mrs. August C. Backus, Jr., referred to above, is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE MILWAUKEE BRANCH OF THE WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

Background and size of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: The parent group was founded by Jane Addams, of Hull House, in 1908, and was known as the Women's Peace Party. In 1915 they joined with women of similar concerns, who came to The Hague in Holland from England, France, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria to found the international organization. The purpose, as revealed by the name, was the achievement through democratic process, of conditions which would make world peace possible, and the extension of human freedom in accordance with the principle of individual dignity. There are today national sections in 34 countries of the world. The membership of the United States section is approximately 6,000. The membership of the Milwaukee branch, which I represent before this committee, is 103.

Mr. Chairman, our organization, which has worked in the field of international relations for almost 40 years, has supported the United Nations Charter since it was signed June 25, 1945, at San Francisco. We have followed closely the functioning of the charter, and therefore submit to you suggestions based on the observation and study of the facts, as we have been able to obtain them.

SUPPORT CHARTER REVIEW CONFERENCE: NEW OPPORTUNITY OPEN

We recommend that the United States actively support the calling of a general conference to review the United Nations Charter, thereby acknowledging the need to correct some of the initial errors it contains, and to provision more adequately the existing statement of purposes and principles. If the men who drew the charter in 1945 had possessed the wisdom and moral courage to implement the high purpose to which the document was devoted, we might now be on the road to world peace. A review of the charter will again afford this opportunity. As in the case of our own Articles of Confederation, the interdependence of states was not sufficiently recognized in the charter, and the delegation of that portion of sovereignty which would be adequate to establish world order, based on law, was assiduously avoided. The solid basis on which our own Government rests was made possible, in our estimation, because the men who drew our Constitution proceeded in the body of the document to make practical provisions for carrying out the moral purpose as set forth in the preamble.

THE IMPORT OF WORLD LAW: STRICT LIMITATION

Specifically, our organization recommends for the consideration of this committee the neglected fact that law, impartially drawn and justly administered, is the only alternative to force, internationally, as it is in the affairs of the individual state. We suggest that the plan for the codification of international law and the proposal of new conventions, which the Chinese delegation submitted to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, be used as a guide for revision of the charter in this area. We deem it essential that the word "aggression" be defined in law, with attention to the political and economic, as well as the physical or military aspects of this crime. It should here be noted for the benefit of those persons who are frightened, some to the point of hysteria, at the thought of any law standing above the law of our land, that what is proposed is that we bind ourselves to acknowledged universal moral law. The individual citizen who is without desire to murder or assault his neighbor, does not feel that his sovereignty is impaired or his freedom abridged by the law which defines and prohibits these acts. Why then, should our Nation, which abhors aggression and exploitation, hesitate to subscribe to law, on an international level, which is confined to safeguarding the integrity of the individual states? It is our firm conviction that a legal code which clearly defines the rights and obligations of national governments, and provides protection for those areas of the world which are now moving toward self-government, is the indispensable foundation for world peace. Problems which are of strictly domestic jurisdiction, should remain outside the province of world law.

UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT

Universal disarmament has been a primary goal of our organization since its founding during the First World War. Now that the destructive force of the atom and hydrogen bombs has reached such frightening proportions, and the cost of maintaining armament superiority constitutes an enormous drain on our economy, this goal, dismissed in the past as the idealistic dream of a few visionaries, is considered by millions of citizens, a practical necessity. To the end that a foolproof disarmament program, including all nations, may become a reality, we make the following proposals:

1. The Government of the United States should immediately establish in the State Department a permanent agency, adequately staffed, to study all phases of peace and disarmament and recommend policy from a scientifically sound basis. The intellectual and spiritual resources, which supplied the inspiration for the founding of this democracy, and which are abundant in America today, should be marshaled by this new organ of government. The gravity of the crisis we face today calls for wholehearted effort, and demands creative planning, of which our country is certainly capable, if the need is realized and the proper channels for expression are supplied.

2. The machinery of negotiation, now in the charter, should be revised and strengthened in every possible manner, so that the futile and time-consuming pattern of recrimination may be replaced by earnest effort to establish means of agreement. Compromise, which is implied in the word "negotiation," can be employed as an honorable and useful tool for agreement, except as it would involve a violation of moral principle. The result of compromising moral principle is appeasement, which only serves to destroy our purpose.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

We urge this committee in drawing its report to consider the advisability of recommending the underlying principles to be followed in any possible revision, and thus allow latitude in the working out of detailed provisions.

In this light, the Women's International League confirms its long-standing conviction that universality of membership is a sound and fundamental principle, and an indispensable requisite for effective world order. We are fully aware of the grave problems which are present in this issue, and which currently obstruct the adoption of *de facto* recognition in seating the governments now awaiting admission to the United Nations. The core of this issue, in our estimation, lies in a single question: "Can the inclusion of all nations in the world organization be accomplished in a manner that will serve the cause of peace, not destroy it." We in America should know that in peace, freedom grows and thrives, in tension and war it withers. There are few who still cherish the illusion that freedom and the other eternal values could survive an atomic war.

The criterion for membership in the United Nations should not be the internal political doctrine of a given government, or its practices, however repugnant these may be to those of us who are the fortunate inheritors of traditional freedom, nor should the anachronistic theory of balance of power be the yardstick. How then could advantage accrue through the admission of these new states?

The Charter of the United Nations, chapter II, article IV, reads: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter, and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

We suggest that a revised charter, with binding international law defining aggression as a crime against the world community, and requiring of each nation diligent participation in effecting a disarmament program, would provide a tangible test of the "peace-loving" qualifications of the applicant.

PROBLEM OF DIRECT REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLES IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Clark-Sohn proposals and other serious studies suggest several methods of instituting direct representation in the General Assembly on a basis similar to that used by our House of Representatives. The goal of providing a means whereby the needs of people, as distinguished from governments, may be more directly reflected in the United Nations, is a valid one, we believe. However, we feel that hasty adoption of a radical change in the methods of representation would be highly inadvisable at this time, and might well defeat its purpose. Long-range planning by a committee of social scientists, drawn on a geographical basis, should precede any change in this area of the charter.

THE VETO AND STRUCTURE OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The inclusion of the veto in its present form, as well as the structure and function of the Security Council, aroused strong objections from many of this Nation's political scholars and informed organizations, when they were proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. The unrealistic assumption that the five great victorious powers would remain forever the "good states" capable of unanimous altruism in behalf of the lesser states, should by now be apparent to all. The arbitrary power vested in the Security Council is a direct negation of the declared purposes and principles of the charter. We suggest that the Security Council be enlarged to give more representation to the small nations, that the veto power as it now stands, enabling a single nation to block an action on the basis of self-interest, be abolished. A two-thirds vote or simple majority, according to the nature of the decision might be an advisable substitute. If the veto is retained, provision should be made for the Assembly to override by a two-thirds veto. A further system of checks and balances should be worked out.

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT AND POLICE POWER

The highly technical questions of strengthening the International Court and enlarging its jurisdiction, we feel, should be put in the hands of top legal experts. The size and nature of the agency to supervise the disarmament process, when it is agreed upon, and to enforce compliance with international law, is contingent upon the provisions yet to be made. Therefore specific recommendations at this time, can only be based on conjecture, and serve the negative purpose of supplying material for argument.

WELFARE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In closing, the Women's International League states its agreement with UNESCO that "wars are born in the minds of men," but we submit that there is substantial evidence to prove that wars are also connected with the stomachs of men.¹ The technical assistance program should accordingly be strengthened by greater financial provisions and proper emphasis. The inspiration for peace is born in the hearts of men. It will come, not from men, but through men from God.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vincent Mercurio, appearing for the Columbus Club.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT MERCURIO, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. Mercurio. I am Vincent Mercurio, appearing for the Columbus Club, an organization of Americans of Italian descent, at the express request of its president. I am also a member of the American Legion and of the executive committee of the Milwaukee County Republican Party. Fundamentally, however, I speak today on behalf of America.

Dr. Becker, of the faculty, University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, debated the question of world government before the 18th ward unit of the Republican Party last Monday night, upholding the plan for a united world government, in opposition to former Attorney General Morgan.

NO TAXING POWER FOR THE U. N.

Dr. Becker said the world government would have taxing power but the charter would limit the amount of tax to 2 percent of national production. When Mr. Morgan asked him if he realized what that meant he said the American share on last year's production would be \$7 million. Of course, that is obviously ridiculous. United States Steel alone, on its 1953 production, would pay a world government tax of \$78,833,145.92, which is 2 percent of its total sales plus increase in inventory over the close of the preceding year. Just one corporation would pay over 11 times the amount our world federalist friend would have us believe would be the world tax of the entire Nation. General Motors would have to pay a world government tax higher than that of United States Steel.

The same thought is basic in the membership of United Nations. They say that each nation, for the expenses of United Nations, should be assessed in proportion to ability to pay. Their conception of the measure of ability to pay is the total value of the nation's annual production.

That means confiscation of property. Many farmers sold thousands of dollars worth of farm products, but after paying interest on their mortgages, repairs on machinery, and labor costs they had nothing left. Many small-business men, and big corporations for that matter, often have years where they realize no profit; instead, they find themselves in the red at the end of the year. Under a world government 2 percent tax on production, they would be not only in the red, but a part of their property would be in the hands of the Reds, for a world government is bound to be socialistic, just as a majority of the United Nations today are socialistic.

¹ See Pan American Union Report (Nov. 2, 1942) as published in American Journal of International Law, January 1944.

The program of International Labor Organization is one of state socialism, and ILO is dominated by U. N. members—52 out of a total of 66. Of the remaining 14 members of ILO, several are Communist nations rejected for membership in United Nations because they were not peaceful nations. They were aggressors.

Not only should we stay out of a world government which would distribute the wealth of America among Asiatics, Africans, and Europeans; we should also amend the Charter of the United Nations so that any contribution we make toward United Nations expenses beyond our normal share of one-sixtieth would be on a voluntary basis. We have paid as much as 40 percent of the United Nations expenses because we have been assessed 39.98 percent of said expenses.

They now have the power to assess us whatever they determine our national production warrants and suspend us from the United Nations if we do not pay the assessment.

That is all wrong. If Guatemala is to have—and it does have—as many votes as we have in the General Assembly which determines the budget of the United Nations and how it shall be spent, it should be responsible for an equal share of those expenses.

TAXATION IN PROPORTION TO REPRESENTATION

We fought the Revolutionary War on the slogan of "no taxation without representation." [Applause.] Our slogan in asking for charter revision should be "taxation in proportion to representation." Let the rest of our contribution, if any is required, be voluntary.

We have always helped the unfortunate all over the world—India, China, Africa, Europe. But from "bundles for Britain" to the present economic assistance it has always been on a voluntary basis except in the case of the expenses of the United Nations.

Don't give them the right to demand that we must contribute from our capital assets to raise their standards of living to ours.

What will become of the wages of American workmen and their living standards if workmen in other lands who now live on a few handfuls of rice a day are to be given the same pay as American workmen for the same class of work? That is the declared program of the United Nations. It will be the public policy of a federated world state beyond any doubt.

We support our charities through community chests and we are glad to do so, but would you give your community chest directors the power to tax and collect from you what they thought they needed? Of course not. If you did, their staffs would multiply and their budgets would soar. You are willing to buy pencils and drop coins in the cup of street mendicants, but would you give them the power to tax you and demand such share of your production as they thought they needed? Of course not. You keep that on a voluntary basis; yet, in the United Nations you do exactly what you would not do in your personal charity when you give the United Nations Assembly power to assess our share of the program to raise the standard of living of all men in all the lands of the earth.

Charity begins at home. I do not want to see the day when a world government tax collector stands ahead of Uncle Sam at the tax window and we must take care of the United States out of what is left. Today the world has a hand stretched out in supplication for the

money of Uncle Sam. Join a world government and Uncle Sam will have to take off his hat and stand humbly in line, catching the crumbs that drop from the table of the overlord—the world state.

I do not want American to be a mendicant province of a socialist world state. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If we are going to hear all the folks who are scheduled, we will have to hurry along.

I might say that the Senate and Congress of the United States determines what we pay to the United Nations, the United Nations does not determine it. [Applause.]

I might say further that when I represented this country at the United Nations we had our pro rata share reduced to one-third of the overhead, and our country has one-half of all the income in the world. But even when it was so reduced the share would have to be approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate.

So the United Nations does not dictate to our Government. Let's get that straight. [Applause.]

Dr. Rudolph F. Morris, of Marquette University. We are glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. RUDOLPH F. MORRIS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have to be very grateful to you and to the subcommittee for holding hearings at the grass roots level.

I am afraid from my observation this morning that emotionalism is very strong at the grass roots, that you gentlemen and we all are learning very much from these observations.

I believe we have to be aware of three things when we are determining our foreign policy, and especially now in discussing proposals for changes in the charter of the United Nations we have to be aware of emotionalism.

Second, we have to be aware of the idealist who holds his head in the clouds and does not take into account the real power situation.

Third, we should not make any propositions which do not take a long-range view. Certain arrangements may be good for us today, but they may turn against us later.

MAINTAINING THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE U. N.

For these reasons I am, in principle, for maintaining the basic structure of the United Nations, especially so far as the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly is concerned.

I am also opposed to a change in the veto power because the time can come—although I hope it never will—that this Nation may be in the minority in the United Nations and then we have to have the right to veto.

For these reasons, I have only two suggestions to make.

MODIFYING PROCEDURE FOR ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

One, to follow the idea that we should be more interested in bringing other nations into membership than expelling them or throwing them out, and, therefore, I have as my first recommendation, which

was already submitted several times today, a change in article 4 with reference to the admission of new members.

I would suggest that the words "upon the recommendation of the Security Council" be eliminated. It is doubtful that the Soviet Union will accept such a change, but we will, at least, take the initiative to come to some constructive solution of membership admission.

Whether that will succeed will depend upon what the actual situation will be a year from now as to whether those who have asked for admission are still waiting at the doors to be admitted then or not.

STRENGTHENING U. N. POWERS OVER NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Now I come to my second proposal, and here it is kind of an innovation, I feel. I believe no one, so far, has gone beyond article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations, but my proposal refers to article 73 the non-self-governing territories.

Mr. Chairman, you made the remark this morning that the United Nations has given independence to so many nations, and I would like to emphasize this point once more. Consequently, I suggest that letter "e" of article 73 be replaced by a paragraph similar to article 87. In other words, it seems to me to be desirable that nonself-governing territories be endowed with greater rights than they have now. The inhabitants of these territories should have the right to petition. Furthermore, the Trusteeship Council should be entitled to ask for full reports from the administering members and to pay periodic visits to the territories.

We should realize that within the last 9 years great changes have taken place in the position of the nonself-governing territories. The administering powers are giving up their hold over those territories or are about to do so. We, ourselves, would in more than one case prefer that these powers acted even faster than they do—take France, for instance.

The unrest and dissatisfaction in those territories has permanently increased and has reached a boiling point. These centers of fermentation have everywhere caught the special attention of the Soviet Union, and they make the most out of the revolutionary movements for the good of their own propaganda.

Therefore, I consider it as a useful strategy if we shall take the initiative in proposing the necessary changes of the charter.

Our own vital interests would not be affected by such a change, but our relations to the populations of the nonself-governing territories would greatly improve if we made ourselves spokesmen of their interests, and would prevent the Soviet Union from taking the role of protectors of suppressed nations. Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Gillette desires to speak to you.

NO MAJOR CHANGES ADVOCATED

Senator GILLETTE. I just wanted to call attention to two statements in your very excellent presentation here that seem to me inconsistent. In the first paragraph you stated:

But it is one thing to propose and to vote in favor of such a conference, and another to present proposals for changes that either have no chance to be accepted or may be inconsiderate from the point of view of our practical interests.

Then on pages 3 and 4 you suggest that in section 2 the words "upon the recommendation of the Security Council" be eliminated, and then you say it is doubtful whether the Soviet Union will accept such a change. But we should, at any rate, take the initiative in presenting it; we should at any rate try to ease up article 4.

Aren't those two statements inconsistent, one, that we should not present any proposal that we think will not be adopted, and the other, regardless of whether it is to be adopted or not present it?

Mr. MORRIS. What I meant by my first statement was that we should not, for instance, suggest a complete change in the basic structure of the Security Council and General Assembly. That would be inconsistent, I believe.

But a single detail like article 4, even if it may not be accepted, we should at least try to have it accepted.

Senator GILLETTE. You feel we should present it anyway if we believe it is a constructive change?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; that is right.

(The full prepared statement of Dr. Morris is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY DR. RUDOLPH E. MORRIS, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

I am opposed to basic changes in the U. N. Charter for reasons to be presented later. But I consider it necessary that the General Conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter (art. 109) be held. All member-nations should have the opportunity to discuss possible changes and to participate in final decisions. The United States as one of the leading world powers should not even make it appear as though she wanted to prevent a review of the Charter. But it is one thing to propose and to vote in favor of such a conference, and another to present proposals for changes that either have no chance to be accepted or may be incon-siderate from the point of view of our practical interests.

I would like first to discuss a type of proposals we should not submit to the conference.

(a) There are many idealists among us who think in terms of a perfect Charter and recommend changes that would bring the Charter close to an instrument which would secure permanent peace. They would like to use the conference to become a sounding board for the spokesmen of world government or for those who believe an international organization can be made strong by a constitution which in its text is coherent, logical, and provides for all the means of enforcement one considers necessary for maintaining peace and order in the world. These people are in error; they try to put the cart before the horse.

If we want the Charter as strong as possible we should take the power factor into account. This is what the "founding fathers" did in San Francisco, 1945. The Security Council was set up, and a balance between it and the General Assembly established to the effect to give a voice to every member and yet, to acknowledge the fact that the leading powers alone are powerful. In this connection, and only in this, one has to understand the function and meaning of the veto. The makers of the Charter started also with the assumption that there would be a basic agreement among the leading powers, including the Soviet Union.

Today things have changed insofar as the basic agreement no longer exists; this fact has seriously weakened the U. N. If we want to maintain the organization—and I think that no responsible person can have any other goal—we must again be as realistic as possible. This means we have to keep the organization running in spite of the cleavage between us and the U. S. S. R. Consequently, we have to avoid everything that would make the U. N. stronger on paper because that would be identical with its weakening in its actual work. The U. N. today can function, though modestly, only under the condition that the Soviet Union can occasionally agree to measures proposed by us or others. It is our interest that at least temporary agreements are being reached with the U. S. S. R. here and there, especially in areas where we have built up positions of sufficient strength. We should avoid to propose any changes that would give the U. S. S. R. an easy pretext to stall or to prevent decisions. They should, if they do so, bear the full responsibility before world public opinion. For this reason, I suggest

that we abstain from proposing any change in the relationship between Security Council and General Assembly and that we maintain the veto regulations (art. 27).

(b) There is a second principle regarding proposals we should NOT make. We are tempted to think exclusively in terms of the present situation and to avoid to imagine that the picture could change. Right now the U. S. S. R. is always in the minority, and has been so all the last 9 years. This is the reason why they applied the veto so often and why we have never done so. It is true that the U. S. S. R. often abused the veto, i. e., made use of it in a way which was against the spirit of its original meaning to which the U. S. S. R. herself had subscribed in 1945. Still we have to admit that the U. S. S. R. applies the veto each time she feels that she cannot agree to a measure but would be otherwise left in the minority. Could it not be possible that some day we shall be in a similar situation? God forbid that it may ever happen! But we have to think in long-range terms and to include all eventualities. As a leading power, we simply cannot accept being outvoted in regard to a measure which touches our vital interests. Nine years ago, our Senate would not have ratified the Charter if it had not contained the veto. Nothing has changed in this respect today.

If we take the long-range view, we should also avoid to propose any changes which would perhaps appear to be useful right now in regard to the abnormal China situation. Certainly it would have been much better if in 1945 China would not have been admitted as one of the permanent members of the Security Council. But this cannot be changed now.

These are the reasons why, in my opinion, we should not propose any change which refers to the essential structure of the U. N. This is the only realistic approach to the present situation.

I have to submit two recommendations for Charter revision:

(1) I think we should propose a change of article 4 with reference to the admission of new members. We should propose that in section 2 the words "upon the recommendation of the Security Council" be eliminated. It is doubtful whether the U. S. S. R. will accept such a change. But we should at any rate take the initiative to come to a constructive solution of membership admission. Even here the actual situation will be the basis for the final decision of the General Conference. If until 1955 we and the U. S. S. R. come to an agreement about the admission of those nations who have applied, a change of the charter in line with my proposal may be feasible. If, however, the present disagreement continues, probably no chance at all regarding article 4 can be carried out. But we should at any rate try to ease up article 4.

(2) My second proposal refers to article 73. I would like to see letter "a" be replaced by a paragraph similar to article 87. In other words, it seems to me to be desirable that non-self-governing territories be endowed with greater rights than they have now. The inhabitants of these territories should have the right to petition. Furthermore, the Trusteeship Council should be entitled to ask for full reports from the administering members and to pay periodic visits to the territories.

We should realize that within the last 9 years great changes have taken place in the position of the non-self-governing territories. The administering powers are giving up their hold over these territories or are about to do so. We ourselves, would in more than one case prefer that these powers acted even faster than they do. The unrest and dissatisfaction in these territories has permanently increased and has reached a boiling point. These centers of fermentation have everywhere caught the special attention of the U. S. S. R., and they make the most out of the revolutionary movements for the good of their own propaganda. Therefore, I consider it as a useful strategy if we shall take the initiative in proposing the necessary changes of the charter. Our own vital interests would not be affected by such a change but our relations to the populations of the non-self-governing territories would greatly improve if we made ourselves spokesmen of their interests, and would prevent the U. S. S. R. from taking the role of protectors of suppressed nations.

Senator GILLETTE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that Mr. Arthur Augostini and Mr. Marvin Klitsner who have been on this list as Nos. 9 and 11 are not here.

The next speaker to be heard will be Mrs. Earl Parkman.

STATEMENT OF MRS. EARL PARKMAN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. PARKMAN. Good afternoon, Senator Wiley and your distinguished colleagues.

It is a pleasure to see you here on Saturday, Sunday, or any day. The CHAIRMAN. You like working on Saturday, too, do you?

Mrs. PARKMAN. I enjoy it when it is for such a good cause.

I am from Milwaukee, a housewife, a mother, and my civic activities have included in recent months discussion group leadership in Great Books program and in other groups throughout the city.

During the past few months, there has been a tremendous rise of public interest in the Charter of the United Nations, due in large part to the announced intention of your committee to bring its hearings into the field, and to Secretary of State Dulles' invitation to the American people to consider seriously the future of the United Nations.

In Milwaukee, and indeed throughout Wisconsin, discussion groups of all sizes and shapes have sprung up to hammer out the implications in the questions at stake, the participants hoping in the process to clarify their personal views through the give and take of open discussion.

I have had the exciting experience of participating in a number of these discussion groups, and of chairing several of them.

ADVANTAGES OF A FEDERAL SYSTEM

The central interest of most people approaching review of the United Nations is in the question of the control of armaments. Here there is constant confusion because of the assumption that by disarmament is meant the abolition of all armaments. Such is not even the dictionary definition of the term "disarmament," and such is certainly not implied in any federal system. I must bury my dictionary definition.

In considering desirable forms of control upon a group of diverse states who must coexist in a constantly shrinking world—the ideal pattern that constantly comes to mind is the federal system. The first true federal system we established ourselves upon this continent. The systems of checks and balances, the representation of the diverse States in the Federal Legislature, the guaranteeing of the rights of individuals from arbitrary power of the Government, and the system of courts of justice to rule on the legality of legislative acts as well as enforcement procedures, with the Constitution itself as the final authority, seems to most of us ideally just and practical.

It seizes the imaginations of those who attempt to visualize a workable structure for the United Nations. And I believe rightly so. It isn't just American national pride that we project in thinking so, for republics throughout the world have also chosen this pattern which we have established here.

LIMITATIONS OF FEDERALISM ON WORLD LEVEL

But at this point a question arises. We have, through the process of living together on one continent, given our Federal Government control over many aspects of our living together—including interstate

commerce, free movement of peoples, et cetera, that we certainly are not ready to give the United Nations. We must remember that when a group of people has a large body of common interest and points of agreement, they can write themselves a body of law that is quite extensive—they all know what the others are talking about, having over many years established a common background which was not there at the time of the founding.

On the world level, however, the commonality of interest is very limited, and any body of law, or constitution, which they can arrive at will of necessity be very limited. This is all to the good. I would venture to say that the only thing the nations of the world can agree on today is the desire for peace. A United Nations founded on a body of law concerned solely with the control of armed force to prevent aggression can be the salvation of the world community.

To say this does not preclude use of the many valuable techniques and international agreements that we have evolved to date and, I fervently hope, we will go on evolving. The conference table techniques, regional agreements, specialized agencies of the United Nations must continue. But the force of law to prevent aggression, backed by a court system, is the first essential of any real world federation. Such a foundation established the preconditions under which world community can develop in peace, and the conditions of moral life can flourish.

APPLYING ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4 OF THE CONSTITUTION TO THE U. N.

Even here at home we have not resolved all the problems of our mutual existence, and we periodically reexamine the issue of States rights within our own constitutional structure. But on one point we have firmly grasped a workable pattern, and that is in the matter of controlling the armaments of the States that constitute this Nation. And it is on precisely this one point that an exact patterning of the United Nations Constitution upon our own Federal Constitution would be desirable.

Article IV, section 4 of our Constitution reads:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

This does not imply a total void of armaments in any sense. It does imply—and has proven in practice—the controlled use of them under a constituted authority to keep the peace.

NATIONS RESPONSIBLE TO WORLD LAW

The other dilemma that crops up constantly in discussions on the United Nations as a force for peace comes in considering when, in international disputes, this rule of law can apply. Do we have to have little Korean wars before they can be stopped? The existence of a United Nations police force in itself cannot guarantee that aggression will not occur. But, as in our own Constitution, the answer lies in the fact that individuals are responsible to the law. The use of injunction and mandamus by our Federal courts does effectively prevent the mass conflict before it occurs. The United States does

not make war upon a State whose governor has violated the Constitution—our Government, as embodied in the court systems, issues an injunction upon that governor as an individual (as in the case of "Alfalfa Bill" Murray, of Oklahoma, in 1931).

I believe that the United States should cooperate with the smaller countries in their basic proposal—that in resolving these United Nations we should not do a patchwork job, but a wholehearted job deserving of the name of leadership. And I believe, gentlemen, that leadership does not involve following our lowest and basest instincts, but means harnessing our greatest courage and deepest aspiration to the idea of world law, for our own long-term interests, and for our children's sake.

We have the spiritual resources to create just law to govern the use of force between nations. We did it before, and we can do it again. In 1787, the 13 States were 13 sovereign nations, each with their own armed forces. They needed to form an effective alliance, and they thought they knew that it couldn't be done. But Washington said: "Gentlemen, let us raise a standard, to which the wise and honest can repair." And within 14 months after the Constitution was written, the United States of America was a going concern. We did it before, and on a limited base, we must do it now.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Edward LaPlante of Milwaukee.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD LaPLANTE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MR. LaPLANTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee of foreign relations, I am speaking just as an individual and member of the National Congress of American Indians. I was asked by a friend, "Do I think more of my Indian people than I do of humanity?"

I do think that the great racial background we have in America would give our American Indians a real consideration.

Two wrongs do not make a right. World law, I do not believe, will do more than our international law that took away the mineral rights from the Chippewa Indians of the Lake Superior region, which was one of the real wealths and true values of that region.

The Chippewa Indians, a tribe I belong to, never received any royalty for the vast tonnage of iron ore and copper minerals that was taken from those great ranges in the Lake Superior region.

Before we can remove the effects that obstruct world peace, we must remove the causes, such as the injustice found in our Indian treaties, that could breathe ill will.

RECTIFYING INJUSTICES TO THE INDIANS

I believe, before we go into molding a new, vast order as the United Nations Charter, we should look into our own Federal Government that made treaties with our American Indians and find out what was their real content and meaning—such as the 1854 Chippewa Indian treaty signed by more than 80 Chippewa chiefs and headmen at our Madeline Island in northern Wisconsin.

The 1854 Chippewa treaty was to correct the injustices and misunderstandings of the preceding treaties.

We, in today's life, must realize the true value of our fertile soil and its production; we must realize the richness of our God-given natural resources that are very necessary to a free world and freedom of the individual—in plain, the sustenance of life.

We Americans are not isolationists in the pure sense of the word because we are apart by oceans, for it was only the American Indians who were here in the very beginning of its discovery, and the Indians gave this country—through military order—to the people of the world—its many races who reside here and have a voice in their government. So with that we should cherish our American ideals of life and government as the greatest ever written by the pen of man, where justice and social justice are the main pillars of society. Christian civilization should realize its obligation to the more inarticulate of our country, that is, the American Indian.

In our multiple Christian beliefs, coming through our American rights, and choice of worship, should provide ample means for our Congress of the United States to make full financial payments to the American tribes for the full value of our country; also to give them full recognition so the world will know the greatest rights the people of so many races have deprived from the discovery of America that had only Indians on it, and who helped to give the American people some of the greatest rights by signing their treaties, which have served humanity so well.

In the United Nations Charter and its revision, which has much material for study on our foreign policy, I believe takes us away from the core of our thought to this great ideal of life and government and those rather complex natures we find in our democratic process that has delayed calling attention to our Indians and our first dealings.

I say this because the vast loans and program in our foreign policy has further delayed and indebted our American people to the extent that the Indians will not be given a real financial settlement, which they so rightfully deserve.

If we fail to pay the Indians, we would be accepting something for nothing—and that is not good for the people.

Our duty, as Americans and as Christians, is to do first things first, and that is to our homes, families, and country—and to our American Indians.

And when we do this we are making a great contribution to peace and justice.

While I say all of this, I realize the many needs in my own home. Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Edward.

Mr. Edmund Zawacki, University of Wisconsin, department of Slavic languages, Madison. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF EDMUND ZAWACKI, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. ZAWACKI. My name is Edmund Zawacki, of Madison, professor of the University of Wisconsin. I speak for myself as a concerned citizen.

My testimony is arranged under three topics:

One, the value of the United Nations under its present charter. Two, what is wrong with the present charter? Three, recommendations for changes.

I think I can summarize the first topic and read the last two, all in 5 minutes.

VALUE OF THE CHARTER

In assessing the United Nations under its present charter, four features stand out in my mind. In the order of their value as I assess them they are, first, and most valuable, the existence itself of the United Nations as a concrete good; second, peripheral agencies like the Food and Agricultural Organization and the World Health Organization. Third, the General Assembly, and last and least valuable, the Security Council.

From the diminishing progression in value of these four features as I have analyzed each of them in my written testimony, it is clear to me at least that the usefulness of the United Nations under its present charter decreases and becomes perverted to the uses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as we pass from the bare facts of a worldwide organization of nations, which is necessary for peaceful intercourse among peoples; and from the activities of peripheral specialized agencies like the FAO and the WHO, which are useful and good; through the parliamentary functioning of the General Assembly, which is being manipulated toward the central core of the whole organization; the Security Council, which is ideologically perverted and unsound.

If my points are well taken, it would seem that a number of things about the Charter of the United Nations must have been unwisely conceived or, at least, that certain considerations which seem to me to be of great importance were overlooked. This brings me to my second topic: What is wrong with the present United Nations Charter?

WEAKNESS OF THE CHARTER

The present charter, by failing to define what peace is, injects into the structure and operation of the United Nations organization the fundamental Communist doctrine of two ideologically hostile worlds.

When the charter was being drawn up, the democratic idea of a single world society was not a fact but a presumption. It was a false presumption precisely because of the functioning of the Iron Curtain which is the principle of restriction, individual and collective, in the intercourse of both people and ideas at home and abroad practiced by Communist Parties everywhere.

The current Communist strategy of "peaceful coexistence" can change the original western presumption of a single world society into political scholasticism perhaps, but by no means into a fact. Structures founded on political scholasticism and false presumptions can hardly be anything but insubstantial. In this sense the United Nations is an insubstantial organization divided against itself, and the international parliamentarism of the General Assembly is at best a cart before the horse.

The second thing wrong with the United Nations: the United Nations as presently constituted operates on the presumption that the vital interest of the common people of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet-dominated countries are identical with the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its affiliates. Such identity of interest is a false presumption, for no Communist Party in the

world is founded on the moral force of the freely expressed and convergent private opinions of even its own members, let alone the millions it victimizes.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your recommendations?

Mr. ZAWACKI. The recommendations are three:

MASSIVE SOCIAL INTERCOURSE AMONG ALL NATIONS

The charter should, in an appropriate place, preferably the beginning, contain a definition of peace, reading something like the following:

Peace is not the mere absence of war but the dynamic opposite. Peace is momentum exerting overwhelming force in a direction away from war. The first and perhaps sufficient condition of peace is the practice of direct, massive, social intercourse among all nations.

Second, Congress should pass legislation giving this definition of peace the moral force of international law by appropriating funds for its practice. As a beginning, the joint resolution already introduced in Congress, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 117 and House Joint Resolution 350, the International Travel Development Act of 1954, should be enacted.

Third, other changes in the charter arising out of this definition of peace should be made as required.

In the idea of massive social intercourse in world society is to be found, I think, a non-Marxist frame of reference for a new United Nations Charter. In it, to my best knowledge, is to be found our Nation's security and free peaceful development in common with all other nations. The reciprocal movement of common people just visiting each other must be massive, just as the momentum of a flywheel must be massive, if it is to serve as a stabilizer. Nor should we be deterred from setting in motion a flywheel for world society by the obstructionism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The people of the Soviet Union should at last be admitted into world society regardless of what happens to the Communist Party or to the present Soviet Government.

If I am mistaken about the potential of Senate Joint Resolution 117 and House Joint Resolution 350 for the purpose of one peaceful world, then, perhaps, wiser men will find a better idea and method. But the light by which they must make their search must be the same as guided mine, for the cosmic glare of nuclear reactions on this planet will remain beyond our lifetimes. The foxfire of antiquated and discredited Marxist doctrine which insidiously lighted the deliberations at San Francisco has failed, and a new charter realistic in the light of the hydrogen fireball is called for.

A document of seven pages, Democratic Ideals and Communist Ideology, broadcast twice over the Wisconsin State radio network, is appended to my four pages of written testimony, and which I give as an extension of these ideas. Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Zawacki is as follows:)

TESTIMONY OF EDMUND ZAWACKI, MADISON, WIS., SPEAKING FOR HIMSELF AS A CONCERNED CITIZEN

VALUE OF THE U. N. UNDER ITS PRESENT CHARTER TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Some of the advantages of the U. N. Organization to the people of the United States, it seems to me, are as follows in the order of their importance:

1. The United Nations Organization, quite apart from its success or failure as an instrument of peace, provides a measure, however minimal, of international intercourse among people. It has, therefore, more than just symbolic or potential value. To plain people like myself the demonstration that a worldwide organization of peoples is feasible at all is something important concretely gained. Toward the orderly and stable functioning of world society, some kind of massive and concerted international intercourse other than trade in commodities is necessary. If the U. N. has not lived up to expectations as an instrument of what its present charter calls "international peace and security," it may be for reasons requiring action of a kind the charter does not provide for. For one thing, the present charter mentions the formula "international peace and security" no less than 31 times, but nowhere defines the nature of peace and security—except by implication as the mere absence of military operations. The charter can, therefore, be improved. And that, after all, is a great virtue.

2. Certain specialized U. N. agencies, like the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization, have done useful work on an international scale. They have, among other things, spread United States know-how in agriculture, public health, and other fields of human endeavor in which we have been leaders. A certain harvest of good will toward the people of the United States has been reaped throughout the world by our activity in these specialized agencies. But the good will has been less, I think, than we would like to believe. It is possible, however, to improve both the effectiveness of these agencies and the returns in reciprocal good will.

3. The General Assembly of the U. N. does actually serve as an international forum for orderly parliamentary debate. Its functions are quite prudently, I think, limited by the charter to "discussing," "considering," and "making recommendations" to the Security Council or to members of the U. N. It does not and should not legislate. Its recommendations have authority only by the moral force of the grassroot opinion throughout the world that it can muster behind them. No American will quarrel with such a procedure.

But it is quite obvious that the General Assembly can muster the moral force of grassroot opinion in the Iron Curtain countries only on such recommendations as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union chooses to publicize for its own purposes. The concrete returns from the General Assembly's debating can therefore be manipulated by the Communist Party by reason of the so-called Iron Curtain. It is for this reason that the sentimental parliamentarian of the General Assembly now seems likely to serve purposes quite different from those which plain people everywhere, including the millions in the Soviet Union and Soviet-dominated states, hoped it would serve.

Once the Iron Curtain is recognized as something more than a geographical line, this Communist manipulation of the General Assembly's deliberations can be stopped by quite simple and peaceful means. The General Assembly cannot begin to serve the cause of international peace until we first define precisely what peace is.

4. The Security Council, the central core of the U. N. structure as constituted by the present charter, has, from the point of view of plain people not only in America but in the whole world, been valueless and even obstructive to the effective pursuit of the four purposes of the U. N., as stated in article 1 of the charter:

1. To maintain international peace and security;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations;
3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems;
4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations to these ends.

Actually, the Security Council has been the cockpit of the very kind of power struggle it was expected to protect world society against. The current open political struggle between the United States Government and the U. S. S. R. over the present Chinese representation on the Security Council may or may not have been in the mind of the Soviet delegation at the San Francisco Conference when the U. N. was born. The United States Government, at any rate, presumed it

was not, but retained a veto power just in case. We are today aware, I think, that the veto is neither a single-edged political weapon nor as strong a one as we thought. It is from its position of power on the Security Council that the Communist Party—through its organ, the Soviet Government—has been manipulating the General Assembly, and perverting the purposes of the U. N.

From the diminishing progression in value of the four features of the U. N. enumerated above, it is clear that the usefulness of the U. N. under its present charter to the people of the United States and to all peoples, decreases and becomes perverted to the uses of the Communist Party as we pass from the bare fact of a worldwide organization of peoples, which is necessary for peaceful intercourse among them, and from the activities of peripheral specialized agencies like the FAO and the WHO, which are useful and good, through the parliamentary functioning of the General Assembly, which is being manipulated, toward the central core of the whole organization, the Security Council, which is ideologically perverted and unsound. From this progression it would seem that a number of things about the Charter of the United Nations Organization must have been unwisely conceived or, at least, that certain considerations, which seem to me to be of great importance, were overlooked.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE PRESENT UNITED NATIONS CHARTER?

1. The present charter of the United Nations, by failing to define what peace is, injects into the structure and operation of the U.N. Organization the fundamental Communist doctrine of two ideologically hostile worlds. When the charter was being drawn up, the democratic idea of a single world society was not a fact but a presumption. It was a false presumption precisely because of the functioning of the Iron Curtain, which is the principle of restriction, individual and collective, in the intercourse of both people and ideas at home and abroad practiced by Communist parties everywhere. The current Communist strategy of peaceful coexistence can change the original western presumption of a single world society into political scholasticism perhaps, but by no means into a fact. Structures founded on political scholasticism and false presumptions can hardly be anything but insubstantial. In this sense the U.N. is an insubstantial organization divided against itself, and the international parliamentarism of the General Assembly is at best a cart before the horse.

2. The U.N. as presently constituted operates on the presumption that the vital interests of the common people of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet-dominated countries are identical with the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its affiliates, of which the Soviet and satellite governments are the administrative organs. Such identity of interest is a false presumption, for no Communist Party in the world is founded on the moral force of the freely expressed and convergent private opinions of even its own members, let alone the millions it victimizes. Communist Parties are exclusive organizations, like every political conspiracy. The people in the iron curtain countries are resentful Communist victims, not Communist enthusiasts. The U.N. Charter, as it stands now, sustains and gives legitimacy to the regimes that have enslaved several hundred million people in the name of a 19th century delusion.

3. The present charter of the U.N. was formulated in terms and habits of thought realistic perhaps for the power politics of the mid-19th century, but the realities, manifest and foreseeable, of the supersonic hydrogen epoch in which we are now living were overlooked. The wisdom of traditional power politics (the Security Council) has become false in the cosmic glare of thermonuclear reactions deliverable in guided missiles with supersonic speeds. No spot on this planet is more than 25 hours away from any other spot; in 5 years the distance may be 25 minutes for guided missiles.

My country's purposes in the U.N. are not wise, therefore, if they are restricted by the ballast of preatomic political thinking to a static and, consequently, explosive impasse effected by the philosophy latent in the present charter. For we are in actual fact contributing in the U.N. now to a political and social blockade of the Russian, Polish, Chinese, and other peoples victimized in several hundred millions by the Communist conspiracy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The charter should in an appropriate place contain a definition of peace reading something like the following:

"Peace is not the mere absence of war but the dynamic opposite. Peace is a momentum exerting overwhelming force in a direction away from war. The

first and perhaps sufficient condition of peace is the practice of direct, massive, social intercourse among all nations."

2. Congress should pass legislation giving this definition of peace the moral force of international law by appropriating funds for its practice. As a beginning the joint resolution already introduced in Congress, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 117 and House Joint Resolution 350, should be enacted.

3. Other changes in the charter arising out of this definition of peace should be made as required.

In the idea of massive social intercourse in world society is to be found, I think, a non-Marxist frame of reference for a new U. N. Charter. In it, to my best knowledge, is to be found our Nation's security and free peaceful development in common with all other nations. The reciprocal movement of common people just visiting each other must be massive, just as a momentum of a flywheel must be massive if it is to serve as a stabilizer. Nor should we be deterred from setting in motion a flywheel for world society by the obstructionism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The people of the Soviet Union should at last be admitted into world society regardless of what happens to the Communist Party or to the present Soviet Government.

If I am mistaken about the potential of Senate Joint Resolution 117 and House Joint Resolution 350 for the purpose of one peaceful world, then perhaps wiser men will find a better idea and method. But the light by which they must make the search must be the same, for the cosmic glare of nuclear reactions on this planet will remain beyond our lifetimes. The foxfire of antiquated and discredited Marxist doctrine, which insidiously lighted the deliberations at San Francisco, has faded, and a new charter realistic in the light of the hydrogen fire ball is called for.

[The University of Wisconsin freshman forum lecture]

DEMOCRATIC IDEALS AND COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY OR A NEW LOOK AT THE COLD WAR

(By Edmund Zawacki, chairman, department of Slavic languages)

When the first atom bomb exploded over Hiroshima, it smashed more than a great Japanese industrial center. It also smashed certain traditional trains of thought in men's minds. Since Hiroshima, terms have had to be redefined in many fields of knowledge besides physics and chemistry.

Today, the cosmic glare of the hydrogen bomb is the light by which our terms must be redefined particularly in political science. The survival of human life on this planet may be at stake. Nor are such new definitions the exclusive concern of the so-called experts. They are rather the concern of common folk and commonsense.

Let us take the concept of world peace. How should we define it? After all, a definition valid for the dynamism of international life in the supersonic hydrogen epoch is necessary.

Peace must be conceived as something positive and dynamic. It is not the mere absence of war but the dynamic opposite of war. In a single familiar word, peace must be momentum exerting overwhelming force in a direction away from war. No static concept of peace is valid in a world being driven by the atom.

Ordinary commonsense reveals that momentum with this latent power and direction is usual in everyday life among individuals in all societies everywhere. We contribute to it whenever we greet each other in the street, wave a goodbye, or invite each other to the house for a visit. Obviously, the momentum of these familiar actions is away from strife, and its cumulative potential overwhelms those who would challenge it.

We can stand firmly on the assertion that this definition of peace holds as true among nations in world society as among individuals in any community. Stable world peace, therefore, is just as attainable as the peace of any community. But the first condition for it is the practice of direct social intercourse among nations.

Folks at the grassroots of America understand perhaps even more easily than the experts that it is in the power of the American people through legislation by Congress to make this practice the fundamental principle of normal international behavior among all the nations of the world—including the Soviet Union and its satellites—regardless of what the present Soviet Government may say, or do, or

fail to do about it. In fact, the necessary legislation has been formulated in a bipartisan bill which will be introduced for debate in the current session of Congress.

The important truth to grasp meanwhile is that world peace can actually be stable, but only as momentum is stable—dynamically, like the atom.

Once we define peace in these atomic but at the same time familiar common-sense terms, the abstract ideological quarrel between the Communist and the non-Communist world reduces itself swiftly to a single concrete issue, namely, the Iron Curtain.

The so-called Iron Curtain is not primarily a geographical line. Only in the shallowest sense can it be regarded as one.

Viewed from the inside, the Iron Curtain is a politically brutal terrorism in ideas practiced by Communist Parties through police controls wherever they are in power. The Chinese call it brain washing. Its action paralyzes the expression of sincere private opinion by individuals, and thereby prevents the formation of public opinion. In the U. S. S. R., for example, the Russian public is atomized into some 200 million individuals, each fearing his neighbor as a possible informer of the secret police. This is the Iron Curtain. No one dares open his mind to his neighbor. The ultimate purpose of the Iron Curtain in this domestic phase of its action is to eliminate any and every private opinion which might conceivably challenge the Communist Party's ideology from inside the Soviet-dominated area now or in the future.

Viewed from the outside, the Iron Curtain is repressive isolation of the Soviet and Soviet-dominated people from the non-Communist world and the non-Communist intellectual climate. In this phase it is an obstructive activity practiced by the party on an international scale in order to protect Communist doctrines from new, that is, non-Marxist ideas.

The Iron Curtain is, therefore, primarily a repressive and obstructive ideological activity in world society. Its name, coined by Winston Churchill, is badly misleading, for it obscures the dismaying truth that its practice is establishing itself insidiously as a principle of allegedly normal international behavior. And it is being so established as much by western democratic acquiescence as by Communist activity. For, when it ever in the last 35 years did any western power—not excluding the United States—ever once challenge the principle of the Iron Curtain in world society with anything except propaganda, mere proposals, or political sentimentality?

Once we understand the principle and purpose of the Iron Curtain, the relatively new Communist doctrine of coexistence—a doctrine formulated by the late Stalin—shows itself to be a masking maneuver in the cold war. It provides specious moral cover. It attempts to conceal but not bridge the gap yawning between people in world society estranged individually and collectively by the Iron Curtain.

The first and perhaps sufficient condition of one peaceful world is direct, large-scale, social intercourse among all nations. The idea of one world does not require, therefore, any special political structure of the world for its fulfillment. Like world federation or any other cart before the horse. The present structure of independent sovereign nations will serve as well as any.

The very idea, however, of two atomically armed and ideologically hostile worlds indefinitely coexisting peacefully, is worse than a paradox or a delusion. It is actually the first condition for continuing the cold war. And being so, it makes for the hot-trigger instability the whole world is aware of today. After all, how long can we juggle two subcritical masses of uranium without an explosion?

It is from the doctrine of coexistence that the Communist so-called peace offensive was launched during Stalin's lifetime. Stalin's death in no way changed the doctrinal base from which it operates now and will continue to operate. Because it has scored important but, fortunately, still unexploited victories in the West, one may seriously ask whether the western stampede toward the spurious concept of peace formulated by Stalin in the term "coexistence," is not a greater danger for the immediate future than the military power of the Soviet Union.

At the very least, American devotion to peace has been cast in doubt even among our friends, and a new wave of wishful thinking that the cold war can be settled by diplomatic horse trading with the present Soviet Government has risen in the West. Quite obviously, it is nothing but wishful thinking to believe that the cold war can be settled by acquiescing in the very principle and condition of its continuation.

Here a warning is perhaps in order lest our hopes in President Eisenhower's proposed international atomic pool rise too high for our own good. Because the President's atomic proposal does acquiesce in the principle of the Iron Curtain, and does seem to accept the idea of coexistence on Communist terms, the plan can hardly give us the position of overwhelming moral strength we need for effective negotiation with the Soviet Government. Under such circumstances we court a serious ideological defeat. The original blarney from Moscow radio that the President's U. N. speech was a threat with the hydrogen bomb should not be too easily forgotten. This slander was never recanted. Nor did our Ambassador ask for an explanation or an official apology. Arthur Dean, our chief negotiator in Korea, walked out of the peace negotiations there for less.

Precisely what is the role of military power in the cold war? If we in America take accurate measure of the Soviet Government's military power, we must admit that it is already too great for us to challenge in the actual field without risk of losing all or most of our allies and courting an atomic war. This is perhaps why President Eisenhower's speech last April calling for Soviet deeds of peace was diagnosed and treated by the Soviet Government as United States blarney with the atom bomb (*Izvestia*, April 25, 1953), and why the President's U. N. speech was blasted by the Moscow radio on December 9 as a threat with the hydrogen bomb. But quite apart from who is blarney or threatening whom by shooting off atom bombs and hydrogen devices in their own backyards, American military power is also too great for the Soviet Government to dare challenge in the actual field. This being so, a military impasse between the Communist world and the western democratic world has been reached by reason of atomic armaments. Neither side can win an atomic war. And both sides should know it.

After the experience of Korea, it is hardly realistic to hope that such an impasse can be resolved by ordinary horse-trading deals with the present Soviet Government. The solution is not to be found in pretense power politics renamed "negotiation from strength." The hydrogen epoch is upon us. The destructive potential of thermonuclear weapons is foreseeably so great that by the end of even the next 5 years the factor of superior firepower in weapons of this kind will be politically meaningless. Perhaps it already is. The test of political strength, therefore, must be coming in a different field altogether.

If American political leadership should in these conditions continue to improvise in negotiations from obsolete strength—and by this I mean military strength, including H-bombs and what have you—it will not take many Big Four Conferences before we shall be obliged to retreat ideologically either into irresponsible bellicosity or into a stylized Maginot-line mentality behind the hydrogen bomb. A Maginot-line mentality is the mentality of coexistence, the myopic outlook the leaders of the Communist world are maneuvering us into.

It should be pretty obvious to most people by now that the strategic objective of the Communist peace offensive is to outflank the western democratic idea in men's minds and turn it upon itself much like the Maginot-line was outflanked and turned in military operations during World War II. How great a victory this so-called peace offensive has won, was revealed not long ago when Mr. Clement Attlee ascribed some of his frustration as a British political leader to allegedly antiquated features of the Constitution of the United States. In Mr. Attlee's view the President would be able to negotiate with more authority in international conferences if he were not so much hampered by Congress.

The opposite side of Mr. Attlee's thin coin is Senator Bricker's proposed amendment to the Constitution, which provides that the President's authority in international negotiations be limited still more than it is now by Congress.

Unlike as these two attitudes may appear, they are similar in that they both reflect dissatisfaction with the Constitution of the United States. Both contribute to confusion in western democratic thinking. The Attlee-Bricker contradiction, therefore, seems to mark a victory for the Communist so-called peace offensive. Although these two statements would perhaps be the last to regard themselves as ideological casualties in the cold war, the ideological casualties for the West can, indeed, become catastrophic unless the spurious Communist peace offensive is routed in time. In this connection it is worth recalling that the issue in a recent French election was alteration of the French Constitution.

For reasons like these it is important that people everywhere understand that democracy is a process, not a government structure nor a type of political machinery. We should be more chary of plating the label of Fascist or Dictator

on people who are on our side of the ideological struggle. Any and every system of government in America, Europe, Asia, or Africa functions democratically in the western sense in proportion as: (1) Private opinion can cumulatively become public opinion; (2) the moral force of public opinion can be exerted on public servants and thus be embodied in national policy at home and abroad. This is the acid test of whether one government is more democratic or less democratic than another.

Connected in dynamic terms like these, democracy is neither American, nor British, nor French. It is human and humane, and capable, therefore, of controlling the atom. Traded though it may be by Communist Parties, democracy lives in the yearnings of the Russian and satellite peoples. The evidence is unmistakable.

Perhaps because we are accustomed to think of diplomacy, too, in what are now antiquated preatomic terms, we in the West have tended to accept without enough criticism the notion that the way to peace is the door of the conference room. In present conditions this is not true at all. Every diplomatic agreement made by us with a Communist government remains an insubstantial deal and an ideological defeat. The reason is quite simple. We in the West negotiate on the presumption that the world is a single society of nations. Precisely because of the Iron Curtain, the presumption is false. Nor can the doctrine of coexistence make it more than politically scholastic. Deals based on politically scholastic and false presumptions can hardly be anything but insubstantial. But they do contribute to our gradual reconciliation with the Iron Curtain as compatible with world peace. And that is an ideological defeat.

Such a situation, to put it mildly, leaves the Western democracies in an awkward dilemma. But the horns of the dilemma can be turned to toss the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

It is generally recognized—or it should be—that the Soviet Government is only an organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. What we in the West perhaps do not perceive steadily enough, is the truth that the party does not operate the Iron Curtain by choice. It has no other choice.

The alleged scientific truth of Marxism has always been so fragile and is now so thoroughly discredited at home by the experience of the Russian and satellite peoples, that it has required the most brutal repressive apparatus the world has ever seen in order to protect it and sustain it. Marxism does remain, nevertheless, the "revealed truth," as it were, of the Communist pseudo-religion, and, as such, it gives its specious moral justification to every act of the Soviet Government at home and abroad. Everything the party does is represented as morally justified by its alleged scientific shortcut to the millennium. The party cannot abandon the Iron Curtain which sustains the so-called scientific truth of its ideology at home, without risking disintegration of its entire body of doctrine and thus losing the moral grounds for its own existence as a party. The element of moral justification is paramount in the cold war.

It would seem, then, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and communism everywhere can be overthrown only by means of and together with the Iron Curtain. We need to be reminded perhaps that we should not regard the Russian and satellite people as Communists any more than the party does. The Communist Party is an exclusive organization—like every conspiracy—in all countries where it has come to power. In the Soviet Union it comprises about 3 percent of the population.

In the United States it is not the President nor the Department of State but the Congress which has the means to bring overwhelming moral force to bear directly and exclusively on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its affiliates. Legislation is now in process whose action will completely disintegrate the Iron Curtain rather than merely try to penetrate it. Representative Javits, Republican, of New York, and a bipartisan team of cosponsors from the House Foreign Affairs Committee will lead the debate on it in the current session of Congress.

What is the nature of the Javits bill? All it proposes is to authorize the President to enter into agreements with the Soviet and satellite governments in order to develop on principle peaceful, large-scale, reciprocal exchanges of visitors between our countries, and it will give the President a position of moral strength to negotiate from by providing the funds necessary for our immediate action in such exchanges. We shall pay the expenses of the Russian and satellite visitors: \$1,000 each for a 2 months' visit—not more than 1,500,000 visitors annually for 3 years.

One million five hundred thousand visitors from the Iron Curtain countries annually! A billion and a half dollars. Have these Congressmen gone nuts? Far from it. Let us consider the bill from shrewd down-to-earth angles--first of all, the economic. A billion and a half dollars isn't bad, but, quite obviously, not a single cent of it can be spent on Russian and satellite visitors unless and until the Iron Curtain disintegrates and the principle of large-scale social visiting among peoples is accepted by the Soviet Government in actual practice. Furthermore, every United States penny would be spent by the visitors right here in the United States. Congress can, therefore, financially afford to set a quota of 1,500,000 visitors. The figure is quite realistic. It is the same as the number of people estimated to be killed in Washington, D. C., should a hydrogen bomb drop on the Capital. It is unlikely that any ciphers can be cut off the end of either quota.

Let us look at the bill now as a new kind of power politics suited to the hydrogen epoch, power politics not with military or economic force, but power politics with moral force.

This measure is designed to destroy the Communist ideology, not the people in the Iron Curtain countries. It is action of a kind and magnitude that makes the Iron Curtain itself a moral issue as well as a political issue between the people of the Iron Curtain countries and their terroristic governments. And it defines the issue in familiar action which plain people throughout the whole world understand--including the millions in the Soviet Union and the satellites. After all, it is a truth as universal as it is homely that, among individuals, only those who wish each other well exchange visits regularly and often. Among nations it is no different.

Our purpose in this action should be openly proclaimed over all the media of mass communication at our disposal--daily, for howsoever long it takes to achieve it. Our purpose is to smash the Iron Curtain as a principle together with Communist Parties everywhere. Our purpose is liberate ourselves as well as the Russian and satellite peoples from world communism. To emphasize the Ism in this statement of purpose is hardly political sentimentality, nor is it madness. It is our choice of the battlefield in the hydrogen epoch. Ideological battles are waged against ideas, and they are fought with moral force, not with hydrogen bombs.

On the simple homely issue of neighborly visiting--once we properly assess its moral potential--we can rout the spurious Communist peace offensive. This would be people's diplomacy, the kind of diplomacy which can turn the horns of the present Western dilemma and toss the Communist Party of the Soviet Union into the historical past where it belongs together with Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and their pseudobiological analogues. In the hydrogen epoch exchange of people is more important than exchange of goods. Goods would inevitably follow behind people once the principle of the Iron Curtain broke down. But peoples' diplomacy requires commonsense and morality on our part. Commonsense is knowing what to do next. Morality is doing it. This means acts of Congress, acts of faith in the strength and virtue of the democratic process.

Naturally, the present Soviet Government as the organ of the Communist Party would refuse to participate in a visiting program of this kind. The party has no choice except refusal. It must do everything in its power to smear and obstruct this action, for its very existence in the future depends on its success in preventing the principle of large-scale social intercourse among nations from prevailing over the Iron Curtain. Only in the actual practice of fundamental principles can the moral strength of Western democracy and Marxist communism be tested. Principles do not prevail upon men by intellect nor mere indoctrination, they require resolute and successful example.

Action of this kind is not a mere proposal to be offered to the Soviet Government to reject or huddle over. As an act of the Congress of the United States, it would be the law of the most powerful people on this planet. Success would not depend on Communist sincerity in negotiation nor on Communist good will. We are not seeking the good will of Communist parties; it is irrelevant. Only the good will of the people of the Iron Curtain countries is relevant; they are not to be made to volunteer for the visitor quotas.

The present governments in the Soviet Union and the satellites must name their candidates to fill the quotas. This is to be liberation, not a rescue. The Communist governments, as the administrative organs of the party, must choose

their most ardent Communists, if they have enough of them, to fill the quotas it is in our power to set, and they must invite American visitors in return. We should demand that the Soviet Government join us in bringing to the attention of the Russian and American people any vacancies left in the quotas by either side. We ourselves should broadcast to the whole world, every day, over all media of mass communication, for however long it takes to establish in men's minds this peaceful and normal democratic principle of international behavior.

Let us at last have done with semihysterical fears of subversion by communism. It is a doctrine discredited in the Soviet Union itself by 35 years of bitter experience. Only so long as we subscribe to the doctrine of coexistence do we make subversion possible. Marxism as an idea still rattles in the empty heads only of self-styled liberals and progressives who are a hundred years behind the times, and in the muddled heads of hysterical ladies shuddering at the name of Robin Hood.

What we should fear, and fear greatly, is the dropping of hydrogen bombs anywhere, anytime, now or 25 years or a hundred years from now. The least of our fears should be people as people, particularly the Russian people, the first victims of the Communist conspiracy. Spies? Agents? Sifting out our military secrets? What strategic meaning have any military secrets now that even the Soviet Government hastens to reveal its own secrets by test explosions? Military secrets and spies are the cloak-and-dagger romance of preatomic politics; if they are not already stuff for the comic books of the past, they soon will be. The hope for peace is not in secrets but in the American and Russian people. Not even Mr. Vishinsky can argue that the act of exchanging social visits is an act of aggression. Nor would the Red Army believe it is an invasion of Russia.

The strategic political initiative in this ideological revolution is properly ours, and the overwhelming moral strength of our democratic institutions will enable us to hold it indelibly. It was not points 1 and 2 in President Eisenhower's address to the U. S. proposing the conversion and limitation of atomic armaments, but point 3 which was the most fertile idea in the whole speech. Point 3 reads as follows: "Allow all people of all nations to see that, in this enlightened age, the great powers of the earth, both of the East and of the West, are interested in human aspirations first and foremost rather than in building up the armaments of war."

Here the President pointed out the field in which the test of strength between American democratic ideals and Communist ideology must come. The new Javits bill is, therefore, enabling legislation giving the President a position of overwhelming moral strength from which to negotiate to establish peace, not coexistence. If we and our children are not to live like rats in cellars and underground, but as human beings worthy to be the creatures of God, then give these ideas your considered thought and come back next time with some searching questions.

I received a letter from Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, Madison, Wis., which is to be printed in the record.

(The letter above referred to is as follows:)

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE,

Madison, Wis., April 3, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senator,

Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I will be leaving on the South American Trade Mission at the time of the United States Foreign Relations Committee hearing in Milwaukee on April 10. In lieu of this absence, it will be impossible for me to appear at the hearing as I had planned.

It is my feeling that the chief point in a charter review conference should be to make the matter of worldwide armament control a principle of first consideration. We must secure the welfare and safety of the United States of America. At the same time we must stand prepared to give the United Nations the power it needs to control the basic arms of war.

I know there will be considerable interest shown by Wisconsin people at the hearing of your committee in Milwaukee. With the new and rapidly changing

trends in the mechanics of war, the rank and file of our citizens are developing a new concept of what the future trends must be in international relations if there is to be an avoidance of global catastrophe.

Sincerely yours,

BILLY K. SWASTON.

The CHAIRMAN. I also received a letter from Francis A. Henson, director, educational and political action of the United Automobile Workers of America of Milwaukee, together with a resolution of the ninth national convention of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, Cincinnati, Ohio, dated November 5, 1951.

(The documents above referred to are as follows:)

UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 7, 1953.

HON. ALEXANDER WILLY,

United States Senator,

Phonkinton Hall, Milwaukee Auditorium,

Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR SENATOR WILLY: I regret exceedingly because of other engagements I will not be able to be present at the hearings on the United Nations Charter review being held by your Senate subcommittee on Saturday, April 10.

Therefore, I am submitting the attached 12 copies of a resolution on the United Nations passed at our last national convention held in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 1951.

Although this resolution is somewhat dated, it is still the policy of the International Union, UAW-AFL, and is self-explanatory.

The main part of the resolution which I would emphasize is our strong belief in strengthening the U. N.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS A. HENSON.

RESOLUTION OF THE NINTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS OF AMERICA AFFILIATED WITH THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, CINCINNATI, OHIO, NOVEMBER 5, 1951

The United Nations will enter its seventh year in 1952 with a clear record of positive achievements. Added together they demonstrate a fact of vital significance to the American people—that the principle of voluntary cooperation for peace, which is a fundamental goal of United States policy, has found expression in a dynamic and practical institution.

Since 1945 the United Nations has grown from a plan on paper to an essential means of international action and a symbol of sanity and peace treasured intimately by free peoples everywhere. It is a historical necessity, a product of our times. Under the pressure of actual events and unforeseen circumstances, it has developed into something more than was planned for at San Francisco, and, perhaps, something less. The United Nations exists today as a living organization accurately reflecting the aspirations, the difficulties, and the immaturities of world society.

However, the U. N., because of charter limitations, has been unable to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. We are called upon now to choose whether to discard the U. N. because of its limitations, or to keep the U. N. and remove its limitations. To discard the U. N. is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. It is surely the better part of wisdom to keep the U. N. and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve peace.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the International Convention of the UAW-AFL urge President Truman, in cooperation with the leaders of Congress, to press for immediate adoption within the U. N. of the following proposals:

1. Establishment of a U. N. Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the U. N. Armed Forces.

2. Revision of the U. N. Charter to include carefully limited law-making and law-enforcing powers necessary to effect settlement of international disputes by means other than war. The necessary revisions might well be drafted by a Charter Review Commission appointed under article 22 of the charter. The revision must include a more adequate method of U. N. representation than the present system of "one nation—one vote."

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. L. E. Lushbough of Oconomowoc, Wis., representing seven community study groups of the Y. M. C. A. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF L. E. LUSHBOUGH

Mr. Lushbough. Thank you, sir. Members of the committee:

It is my privilege to present conclusions reached by a group of men and women after much study and discussion. These citizens from several communities of Waukesha County make these suggestions for charter revision after a series of five open discussion and study sessions beginning last December, in anticipation of this hearing today.

Our chief concern is for world peace, and toward that end we suggest the following proposals for consideration. Since some of these have been outlined repeatedly today, I am merely going to mention most of them:

CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS, INSPECTION, AND A POLICE FORCE

Control of armaments. Enforceable disarmament is the crux of peace and should therefore be the central objective of a review conference. We believe there can be limitations of armaments and that the enforceable powers of the United Nations should be carefully restricted in the field of disarmament and arms control, that those be the only enforceable powers the United Nations would have.

We believe in an inspection system with a tyranny-proof civilian inspection agency with diversified personnel, rotated frequently.

We believe in a police force, a tyranny-proof United Nations police force of limited size to back up the civilian inspection agency. Both forces would be under the close control and constant supervision of a civilian armed services committee of the United Nations.

For example, it seems to me that both Israel and Jordan would have more sovereignty today if there was an adequate inspection force and police force in addition to the United Nation's commission on arbitration. If the culprits that are causing the border trouble could be searched out by a police force and inspection force, we think both nations would have much more chance of sovereignty and have a much better feeling that their rights were being maintained.

FUND-RAISING POWERS

The United Nations should be given the carefully limited right to raise the necessary funds for these forces and we cannot conceive that those funds would in any way compare to the size that the world is now spending for individual armaments. No one today has urged the right of an aggressor nation to be an aggressor, and if no one believes that such a right is inherent, then surely all of us would agree

that if there are to be no aggressor nations, we must be willing to live under the law that would make such aggression impossible.

ADDING ANOTHER HOUSE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We would suggest these changes in the General Assembly:

That one house continue as it is, one sovereign nation represented by one vote.

We believe another house should be added to the General Assembly with delegates elected on some basis of graded population, income, productivity, and ability to support the forces of the United Nations.

We would hope that instead of the Security Council there might, in time, develop an Executive Cabinet of the two-house General Assembly chosen by the General Assembly for a term of specific length and subject to dismissal by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the General Assembly.

U. N. COURTS AND VETO

We believe in a series of United Nations courts being established, as many others have recommended, and we are opposed to the veto if it can be abolished. We believe the present veto is wrong in that it allows one nation to frustrate the will of all others. The present veto is also impractical in that it makes action almost impossible on anything except trivial matters.

In conclusion, we have faith in the intelligence of men and women who hold our destinies in their hands—faith that those directing the revision of the United Nations Charter may perfect a stronger and more just and perfect instrument, that will be accepted by the sovereign nations of the world.

We have confidence that such revisions will remove the fear of aggression and make the sovereignty of nations a reality; a sovereignty in peace to enjoy the fruits of peace.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Lushbough is as follows:)

PROPOSAL BY A GROUP OF CITIZENS OF WAUKESHA COUNTY, WIS., FOR UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

Members of the committee, it is my privilege to present conclusions reached by a group of men and women after much study and discussion. These citizens from several communities of Waukesha County make these suggestions for charter revision after a series of five open discussions and study sessions beginning last December, in anticipation of this hearing today.

Our chief concern is for world peace, and toward that end we suggest the following proposals for consideration.

CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS

Enforceable disarmament is the crux of peace and should therefore be the central objective of a Review Conference.

Limitations

The enforceable powers of the U. N. should be carefully restricted to the field of disarmament and arms control; the powers and limitations to be thoroughly defined.

Inspection

A tyranny-proof civilian inspection agency with diversified personnel, rotated frequently, should be established, with ability to discover and power to apprehend world criminals who violate disarmament agreements. Action would be upon individuals rather than nations. This inspection agency would be able to act upon the offenders in time to prevent aggression; i. e., before the would-be aggressor is able to complete the raising of armies and the building of bombs.

Police force

A tyranny-proof U. N. police force of limited size to back up the civilian inspection agency should be established. This force should be under the close control and constant supervision of a civilian armed services committee of the U. N.

Revenue

The U. N. should be given carefully limited right to raise the necessary revenue for the purpose of administering enforceable disarmament and for that purpose only. All other functions of the U. N. should continue to depend on voluntary contributions.

STRUCTURE AND RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility for international peace and security and for administering enforceable disarmament should be vested in a two-house General Assembly of the U. N. Membership in the U. N. should be permissive; with no nation permitted to withdraw.

General Assembly

The General Assembly two-house system should consist of:

1. One house chosen by popular election with representation based on weighted factors of population, literacy, and productivity.
2. The other house based on sovereign equality of nations.

Executive Cabinet

There would be an Executive Cabinet (instead of the Security Council) of the two-house General Assembly, chosen by the General Assembly for a term of specific length and subject to dismissal by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the General Assembly. The Cabinet should be responsible for the establishment and operation of the inspections agency and the police force, and the administration of General Assembly decisions in the field of enforceable disarmament.

Courts

A series of U. N. Courts should be established that would have compulsory jurisdiction over individual violators of the U. N. arms control laws; and for settlement of issues between nations and the U. N.

THE VETO

The veto as it is should be abolished. In these matters of enforceable disarmament no member should be allowed a veto. The present veto is wrong in that it allows one nation to frustrate the will of all others for peace. The present veto is also impractical in that it makes action almost impossible on fundamental matters since unanimity can seldom be had in any group on other than trivial matters.

With stakes so high, the danger is that we have asked too little, rather than too much. With scientists producing new methods of annihilation, we need to give our best thought to preserving mankind from destruction. The burden of armaments and their potential danger have now become millstones instead of milestones, in the struggle of mankind for peace and freedom.

The aspirations of the great mass of humankind are for the good things—the elemental things: food for children; homes in which to live; a chance to learn, and to have fellowship. We cannot permit the few bent on aggression and destruction to thwart such hopes. Willful men should not be permitted for long to thwart the aspirations of all mankind.

Armaments have not only reached the saturation point—they have nearly reached the annihilation point; which may be the point of no return.

But we have faith in the intelligence of men and women who hold our destinies in their hands—faith that those directing the revision of the U. N. Charter may

perfect a stronger and more just and perfect instrument, that will be accepted by the sovereign nations of the world. We have confidence that such revisions will remove the fear of aggression and make the sovereignty of nations a reality; a sovereignty in peace to enjoy the fruits of peace.

L. E. LUSHBOUGH,
Acting Chairman.

Signed and submitted by:

Mrs. Charlotte E. Bassett, Pewaukee, Wis.; Clarence W. Binzel, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Clarence W. Binzel, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Harry Bogner, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Helene Bogner, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Ruth Ann Brown, Pewaukee, Wis.; Mrs. D. M. Farnham, Waukesha, Wis.; Mrs. Sarah E. Hackbarth, Pewaukee, Wis.; I. F. Harder, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Thomas Heerman, Waukesha, Wis.; R. E. Hoffman, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Carl Johnson, Hales Corners, Wis.; Mrs. Angela C. Johnson, Hales Corners, Wis.; Mrs. Irene Kinn, Okauchee, Wis.; E. E. Kinkel, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. E. E. Kinkel, Oconomowoc, Wis.; L. E. Lushbough, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. L. E. Lushbough, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Louis Mayer, Oconomowoc, Wis.; T. H. Nammacher, M. D., Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Rose M. Nammacher, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Stanley Schlirmer, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Rev. Richard C. Schroeder, Hartland, Wis.; Rev. Rodney Shaw, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Mary F. Shaw, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Gerald B. Spaulding, Oconomowoc, Wis.; David W. Weart, Oconomowoc, Wis.; Mrs. Richard D. Wright, Waukesha, Wis.

Our next witness will be Mr. Walter W. Engelke, principal of the Madison High School. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF WALTER W. ENGELKE, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. ENGELKE. Thank you, Senator. I think I shall accept your invitation to cut it short and use the examples set by Professor Pfankuchen this morning in his very excellent presentation. So I am merely going to mention five points which I have in my statement.

WEIGHTED VOTING

First, I would like to see the voting power in the Assembly changed in such a way as to give representation according to population and resources, and by this method increase the importance of the Assembly. I think such an amendment is basic to strengthening the structure of the United Nations.

FISCAL INDEPENDENCE

Secondly, I would like to see an amendment which would make the United Nations fiscally independent of member states and their permissive contributions.

ENFORCEABLE WORLD LAW

Third, I would like to see enforceable world law adequate to preserve the peace, with the same safeguards to state sovereignty and individual rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

If I may, I would like to parenthetically read a brief excerpt from President Eisenhower's address on the outlook for world peace at Columbia which he made back in March 1950:

The establishment of a United Nations world police, if properly defined and restricted by effective powers, no nation would surrender one iota of its current

national functions or authority, for none by itself now possesses a shred of responsibility to police the world.

THREE-FOURTHS VOTE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO OVERRIDE A VETO

My fourth point is that the rule of unanimity must be amended so that it will not obstruct the wishes of three-fourths of the voting power in the Assembly.

ABOLISHMENT OF ARMAMENTS

My fifth and final point is that the charter must provide speedy and positive means by which national armaments may be safely abolished. Unless and until the peoples of this world are given an opportunity to demonstrate their hatred of war by destroying the instruments of war, governments will never learn the lessons of history. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Engelke.

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Engelke is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY WALTER W. ENGELKE, MADISON, WIS.

Your committee has made it plain that you are deeply interested in suggestions from the grassroots concerning desirable changes in the U. N. Charter. As a representative of the grassroots, may I say that the creation of your committee and this very concern has given a renewed surge of confidence in attaining permanent peace through democratic procedure to those of us who truly value the dignity of human life. You have already achieved a notable advance in that regard.

I believe that the present United Nations Charter represents a compromise of conflicting political ideologies that face a totally different world than existed 50 years ago. I also feel that this is just as true intranationally as it is internationally. We shall never achieve a charter which will satisfy the desires nor meet the difference of all member nations; nor should we vituperate the charter whenever member nations feel it to their singular advantage to make changes. The strength of the charter itself lies in the faith of man that it is not right, but can be amended when preponderant world feeling favors a change.

Your committee has indicated that it is looking for suggestions and ideas of a specific nature that will make the United Nations a more effective force in establishing and maintaining world peace. You will have the difficult task of assessing the relative importance and value of the statements made before you on behalf of individuals and spokesmen for groups. I am less concerned that you find a unique plan than that your report to the Senate reflect accurately the best thinking in the testimony presented in order that the American people may have a truthful picture of this vital issue.

I would like to see the voting power in the Assembly changed in such a way as to give representation according to population and resources, and by this method increase the importance of the Assembly. I think such an amendment is basic to strengthening the structure of the U. N. The particular formula should be one that is simple and reasonable and not subject to controversy.

I would like to see an amendment which would make the U. N. fiscally independent of member states and their permissive contributions. If the Assembly is to function effectively, it should have a dependable source of revenue.

I would like to see enforceable world law adequate to preserve the peace, with the same safeguards to state sovereignty and individual rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. This change in the charter will not eliminate the need nor the desirability of agreements between nations on matters that do not affect world peace.

The rule of unanimity must be amended so that it will not obstruct the wishes of three-fourths of the voting power in the Assembly. In this sense the Security Council will have executive direction rather than legislative authority.

Finally, the charter must provide speedy and positive means by which national armaments may be safely abolished. Unless and until the peoples of this world

are given an opportunity to demonstrate their hatred of war by destroying the instruments of war, governments will never learn the lessons of history.

THE CHAIRMAN. Dr. Arthur Becker of the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR BECKER, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Dr. Becker. Honorable Senators Wiley and Gillette, it is a wonderful opportunity to be here this afternoon to testify on this subject of United Nations Charter revision. I am the Dr. Becker to whom Mr. Mercurio referred previously; certain statements which he ascribed to me were incorrect and misleading.

It was stated that a limited world law and limited world government means socialism. I will not personally answer this belief which I believe unfounded, but I would like to mention the fact that in 1951 Pope Pius XII endorsed and wished success to the efforts of the United World Federalists.

I am sure His Eminence, the Pope, is not a socialist, either knowingly or unwittingly. [Applause.]

I have spent 6 years of preparation on this subject of United Nations Charter revision, and my conclusions are that the basic objectives of the United Nations Charter revision, if it is to achieve world peace, must be the prohibition and prevention of aggression, and the universal and complete disarmament and control of armaments of nations with respect to all heavy weapons. These objectives can be achieved effectively and satisfactorily by the United Nations only through the establishment and enforcement of world law against individuals. The following proposed revisions of the United Nations Charter seem to be necessary and desirable in achieving the aforementioned basic objectives.

MEMBERSHIP SUGGESTIONS

1. **Membership:** All independent States shall automatically become members of the United Nations, without the right to withdraw. Individuals of no nation can be exempted from the obligations of keeping the peace.

The General Assembly shall have the complete authority to suspend a nation from the exercise of its right and privileges if that nation obstructs action of the United Nations in the interest of world peace. The General Assembly shall have the complete authority to restore to a suspended nation the exercise of its rights and privileges.

While China is now a member of the United Nations, its *de facto* government is a matter of fact suspended. The General Assembly need not restore to China the exercise of the normal rights and privileges which accompany membership until China demonstrates peaceful intentions by peaceful actions.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. **The organization of the General Assembly:** The number of representatives from each nation shall be based upon population, education, and capital—manmade productive wealth. Each representative shall have one vote. Apportionment of representatives is to be revised automatically each 10 years on the basis of a world census under-

taken by United Nations officials. The total number of representatives shall not be less than 200 nor more than 400 members. Nations not large enough to qualify for at least one representative may join any other nation by mutual consent to form a common General Assembly district from which one or more representatives may be chosen. Representatives are to be chosen for terms of 4 years by national elections if suitable. Half of the representatives shall be chosen in a nation or district every 2 years.

The present arrangement of five representatives from each nation is unrealistic if the United Nations is to be granted the powers of law.

Representatives shall be seated alphabetically and vote as individuals. This arrangement should help promote justice and the effectiveness of the General Assembly.

PRIMARY POWERS FOR PEACE FOR THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. The functions and powers of the General Assembly: The primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace shall be upon the General Assembly.

In the United for Peace Resolution the Assembly assumed a large measure of the responsibility for the maintenance of peace. The maintenance of peace is assured greater success when all the nations who are expected to cooperate have a voice in deciding whatever war preventative measures should be taken. The alternative of abolishing the veto in the Security Council would be far less acceptable to the vast majority of nations. Also, it would be less effective since the possible objection of one of the big five nations to an important security action will of necessity require the speedy and maximum support from as many of the other nations as possible. This support would more likely be forthcoming if all of the nations whose support is expected and needed would have more voice in making policy and decisions.

LEGISLATIVE POWERS

The primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace shall carry with it the power to deal with disputes and threats to the peace, and to enact necessary legislation, carefully defined, for the prevention of war. Necessary legislative powers shall include the enactment of laws for—

1. Universal enforceable disarmament, armaments control, and the prohibition of acts of aggression.

2. The apprehension and trial of persons suspected of violating the charter or the laws and directives of the General Assembly and the punishment of such persons if found guilty according to due process of law.

3. The establishment and maintenance of adequate civilian inspection and police forces to enforce the United Nations Charter, General Assembly laws and directives, and the judgments of the United Nations courts.

4. The establishment and maintenance of adequate military forces to support the civilian police, if, when, and where necessary.

5. The levying and collecting of taxes and borrowing adequate to finance only those United Nations functions strictly related to war prevention; provided that for all other United Nations activities

taxes may be levied and collected not to exceed 1 percent of the net national product of each nation.

The enforceable powers of the United Nations should be limited almost entirely to matters directly or immediately related to the prevention of war. Moreover, adequate safeguards should be incorporated in the legislative powers to assure effectiveness and to prevent abuse or injustice. Specific details cannot be mentioned here for lack of space.

EMERGENCY POWERS FOR THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Fourth, the Security Council. The Security Council shall be the chief executive organ of the United Nations with authority to act promptly under provisions of the charter and the laws and directives of the General Assembly to deal with breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. The Security Council shall have the power to take emergency action in the settling of disputes which threaten the peace.

While the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace shall be upon the General Assembly, the Security Council shall have special and emergency responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

All decisions shall be made by an affirmative vote of any 7 members, except in the case of emergency actions which shall require an affirmative vote of any 9 members.

Nonemergency actions would not involve the exercise of any legislative powers and, therefore, a majority of more than seven is unnecessary and would render the Security Council less effective. In emergency actions when there would be no time to wait for a directive of the General Assembly the larger majority of nine is highly desirable. The immobilizing effect of the veto must not be retained.

The inspection and police, military, and finance agencies shall be subject to control by the Security Council.

The control of police and military agencies by a civilian executive body is an important safeguard against possible abuse of power by these enforcement agencies. Inasmuch as the Council in its capacity as the chief executive organ of the United Nations would handle such agencies as that of finance it would be desirable to change the name of the Security Council to the Executive Council.

COMPULSORY JURISDICTION FOR THE COURT

Fifth, the courts of the United Nations. The International Court of Justice shall have compulsory jurisdiction over the legal disputes between all nations and to determine the legality of the powers and actions exercised by any organ and agency of the United Nations.

The first part of this provision would greatly increase the effectiveness of the Court in the settling of many disputes between nations. The second part would prevent the United States from assuming power beyond that provided in the charter.

The International Court or an inferior court shall have the power to try persons charged with the violation of the charter and the laws and directives of the General Assembly.

The enforcement of laws against individuals or groups rather than against nations is necessary for justice and efficiency.

A BILL OF RIGHTS AND RESERVED POWERS

Finally, miscellaneous provisions. A bill of rights protecting individuals against arbitrary or unjust action by the United Nations.

This provision is to prevent the United Nations authorities from the possible abuse of power which the United Nations has a legal right to use.

All powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations shall be reserved to the nations and their peoples. Each nation shall have complete sovereignty over its domestic affairs.

This provision is to prevent the United Nations authorities from assuming power to which they have no right.

United Nations officers, representatives, employees, and their families shall have immunity from national reprisal.

This provision is necessary to protect United Nations personnel against intimidation and harm for the carrying out of their official duties.

Amendments to the United Nations Charter shall come into force when passed by a three-fourths majority of the total representatives of the General Assembly and ratified by three-fourths of the nations.

Because of universal membership and the power of law to be endowed upon the United Nations any increase in the powers of the United Nations should receive a very strong endorsement by the nations and their representatives.

Thank you. {Applause.}

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Bernard Alexander is substituting for Mrs. R. M. Franz who was to represent the Milwaukee monthly meeting of the Society of Friends. Glad to see you Mr. Alexander.

STATEMENT OF BERNARD ALEXANDER, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Wiley. The Society of Friends is a religious organization more commonly known as Quakers has a deep concern which it would like to express today. Quakers—Friends—have historically stood out for peaceful settlements of disputes. Today, the instrument through which men may work for worldwide peace is the already existing United Nations. It is this organ which, having made excellent efforts at conciliation in troubled areas, is our continued hope for a stable peaceful world. Mankind has experienced social peace and security first in family and tribe units, and then in great nation states, and ultimately the trend is toward the largest possible peace unit—a governed world community. The United Nations is the expression of this need felt by many men.

It is the peacemaking ability of the United Nations which is the greatest influence in bringing about a peaceful world community. It should be the one recognized place for arbitration and conciliation, where nations may be together and discuss and negotiate and mediate. Unbiased observations in troubles areas of the world should be followed by just decisions. The healing of the wounds of bitterness and misunderstanding between countries by special United Nations peace teams and commissions has already been proved noteworthy and heartening.

UNIVERSALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

To further the peacemaking power of the United Nations many Friends, along with others, have believed in a universality of membership in the United Nations. All peoples of the world are of equal worth and dignity, and, therefore, each country regardless of political system, and desiring membership should be welcomed into this world assemblage. More contact with unlike ideas will promote more creative thinking and reconciliations among the nations. Should conflicts arise between nations under a common government within the United Nations, these would be more easily solved in a relatively peaceful way than if the states were under separate sovereignty outside the United Nations.

It might be advisable to vest more authority in the General Assembly than it has had in the past. It would seem that Secretary Dulles' proposal of some voting in the General Assembly being based on population and economic resources would be a more fair setup than one vote per country.

CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS

All types of armaments must be controlled, inspected, and reduced by an authoritative United Nations agency. The Disarmament Commission set up under the Security Council on January 11, 1952, faced with such tremendous and important work, might well be given additional prestige and impetus were it to be re-formed into a permanent organ, under the Security Council, such as is the Trusteeship Council. As regards inspection of world arms, the already existing peace teams of the United Nations might be an efficient organ for helping in the accomplishment of this. Showing trust and confidence in proposals coming from Russia would help these discussions to proceed in good faith, and concrete results to be obtained.

The United Nations represents man's attempt to bring peace, adequate food and clothing, and health and understanding among the peoples of this world. Therefore, we wish to express our faith in its possibilities, and urge that the United States attempt to improve its possibilities in the coming charter revision.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. I am particularly impressed with the statement that the United Nations represents man's attempt to bring peace, adequate food, clothing, health, and understanding among the peoples of this world. We know that the Friends or the Quakers have made a great contribution to the life of this country, and while they have been folks who have always stood for peace, they have stood by the Government in every war and have always done their part.

The next witness was to have been Mr. Edwin J. Nelson, of the American Veterans of World War II, of Manitowoc, Wis. He has complied with the suggestion this morning that he file his statement. Consequently, he will not be heard at this time. The statement will be incorporated in the record.

(The statement of Mr. Edwin J. Nelson is as follows:)

In June of 1945 at San Francisco, the representatives of the governments concerned made a move that should happen again as the course of time progresses. That was calling for the charter review of the United Nations in 10 years.

The United Nations should come to some solution that will benefit all of the world in the question of peace. Peace is a medium that everyone comforts from. Peace can only be obtained by the complete agreement of every country in the world.

When the words "every country" is stated, I mean that no one country should be allowed after their agreement as part of the United Nations to be allowed to have their ambitions of world domination strengthened by the weakness of another country.

If this situation happens, the United Nations should step in to see to it that the weaker sister has all of the help that it needs. The perfect example is Red China. Red China is not a true representative of the Chinese people. The Reds are a Government of the minority of the people and not a Government of the majority. They came into being not by a democratic election of the people but by strength in arms. Strength in arms is not the way to peace but the way to destruction.

Should the United Nations admit a country that has nothing in its mind but to move further from its boundary? I would say "No." What assurance do we have that they will cooperate with other countries? None.

When the situation in Korea came to a point that was near to the border of Manchuria, did the Chinese Communists try to keep within its own boundaries? No. They took it upon themselves to become a part of the battle.

Senator Wiley in his weekly newsletter stated "Foreign people are hoping that out of the Geneva Conference on April 26 that some agreement may come whereby Communist China may be admitted to the United Nations in return, perhaps, for a settlement in Indochina and elsewhere." Senator Wiley strongly opposes any such agreement. It is the opinion of this organization that Communist China should not, under any circumstances, be admitted to membership in the United Nations. I hereby submit this testimony for your consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Sue Martin, of Neenah, is our next witness. We are, indeed, glad to see you.

STATEMENT OF MISS SUE MARTIN, NEENAH, WIS.

Miss MARTIN. My name is Sue Martin. My home is in Neenah, Wis. As president, I am representing 5,000 members of the Methodist Student Movement of the State of Wisconsin which is the college youth organization of the Methodist Church. At its annual meeting, April 2-4, the Methodist Student Movement requested me to make the following statement in its behalf.

SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

We reaffirm the necessity of an international organization to preserve human rights and peace for all people. Mankind's best political hope for peace lies in the United Nations as the international organization of cooperation. There is emerging from it a larger vision of the total interest of the world. In spite of obstacles, freedom of presentation and discussion still abides in its assembly and councils.

In the Charter of the United Nations we read these words:

To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental rights, in the dignity and worth of human persons, to establish conditions under which justice and respect can be maintained and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

As Christian students we heartily reaffirm them as statements in accord with Christian ideals and principles. We are concerned that the United Nations do all within its power to accomplish these ends.

Despite tensions within the United Nations, we believe that it must be kept united. Regardless of difficulties that may be encountered

in arriving at agreements or in securing unanimity, the United Nations should be maintained for the nations of the world.

We call for revision of the United Nations Charter in such manner as to enable that body to enact, interpret, and enforce world law against aggression and war and to preserve human rights and peace.

MORE COOPERATION IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS

There have always been opportunities for cooperation in the field of social and economic relations. We of the Methodist Student Movement of Wisconsin wish to commend the specific and specialized agencies such as UNESCO, FAO, WHO, UNICEF, and the Narcotics Commission that have come forth with important suggestions and requests in these fields. These agencies have promoted cooperation. They have sought to make available benefits from our industrial progress and scientific advances to these millions who would otherwise have died of hunger, cold, or the lack of medical care. They have started where the people were, working with them, cooperating, yet not dominating.

We believe that the United States Government should increase its financial support of the United Nations, especially in directing more funds and resources to the United Nations technical assistance program. We realize what our present tax burdens are, but we still feel our contributions to the United Nations are insignificant compared with our appropriations for war purposes.

In this age of the hydrogen bomb and jet speed it is more clear than ever that if we are to exist as individuals and nations we must learn to cooperate. As Methodist students of Wisconsin, we feel that the United Nations is our best present instrument of cooperation.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a teacher at the college?

Miss MARTIN. I am a student. I will graduate in June.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to compliment you on a very succinct statement that covers in a very dynamic way the issues that are involved.

I am interested in how you got it together. If you are a senior, was it as a result of your mind or the result of others in consultation or what?

Miss MARTIN. Last weekend, we had our spring conference of the Methodist Student Movement, and together we formed a document or went over and made a list of statements which we would like to have included in this, and several of us got together and composed it and this is what happened, this is the result.

The CHAIRMAN. It represents a consensus, then, of quite a few minds?

Miss MARTIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have pretty strong convictions on the subject.

Miss MARTIN. Yes, we do.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Miss MARTIN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Harvard C. Smith, of the Mary D. Bradford High School, an instructor there. Glad to see you, Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF HARVARD C. SMITH, KENOSHA, WIS.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you Senator Wiley and Senator Gillette.

Gentlemen, I come before you as a naturalized citizen of the United States. Although most of my forebears were from this country, I was born and reared in Canada, so I am a citizen of this country by choice and not by accident. Having been reared in a country outside of the United States, I probably have had more than the usual interest in the activities of this country which I now call my own—particularly in the field of foreign relations. I came to Wisconsin as a young man, shortly after World War I, to attend college. I liked Wisconsin so well that I decided to stay here after graduation.

It was just about that time that I felt the United States had passed up one of its greatest opportunities for establishing a lasting peace. I can still vividly recall the bitter disappointment that I felt when the United States repudiated the League of Nations, and that was over 30 years ago. I have always felt that if our country had joined with our allies in 1920 to make the League a working world organization that the first of the modern-day aggressors would not have taken the first step on the long road that led up to World War II. I am referring, of course, to Japan walking out of the League, coincident to the invasion of Manchuria. A few years later Mussolini invaded Ethiopia. If these United States had been in there "pitching" I think Hitler would have been stopped before he ever got started, and we wouldn't be in the mess that we are in now.

Now this Nation has another golden opportunity and I shudder to think of the consequences if we should fail to bend every effort to bring about a permanent world organization, capable of settling disputes between nations by peaceful procedures.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHARTER REVISION

The hopes, prayers, and aspirations of a war-weary world suddenly seemed within our grasp in 1945 when the United Nations was born in San Francisco. Imperfect as the United Nations has shown itself to be in the past 9 years, it has accomplished a great deal of good. It was the beginning of a new order in world affairs. In the light of what we now know, I believe the great majority of our informed citizens feel that next year an opportunity presents itself to make the United Nations a more efficient instrument for world peace. A revision of the United Nations Charter is in order I feel, and is the next step in the evolution of mankind's attempt to provide protection for himself by means of government. And what greater protection do we need than that which would remove the sorrows, burdens, and costs of recurring wars?

I am a teacher, and instructor of printing. One of the exercises that every student sets up in type and prints on a press contains the following words, and I might say this was sort of a collective thought of several dozen students as a result of their reading it. It is just a little paragraph as one of the exercises in one of my printing classes.

Humanity's very existence on this planet is threatened by the destructive forces created by science. With the development of the atom and hydrogen bombs, mankind has made it possible to exterminate itself. If nations do not

learn to live in peace and harmony with each other our present civilization may perish from the earth. World affairs must be settled in the same manner that our local, State, and National problems are solved. War settles nothing, but rather engenders hatreds and fears that lead to further conflicts. War is a luxury that mankind cannot afford. Peace is a dream that man can achieve if he so wills it.

I believe the above sums up the fears that many people have regarding the state of armed preparation under which we now live.

WASTE OF WARS AND ARMAMENTS

I am almost overwhelmed when I contemplate the good things for mankind that could be had with but a fraction of what is being extracted from everyone to pay for past, present, and future wars. A tiny fraction of that amount expended on a program that is very close and dear to me would accomplish miracles. That program is the student exchange program that is operating in our high school in Kenosha and several hundred other high school of the Nation, a program that is building up good will between all nations in the world, good will and understanding that will go far to prevent the inclination toward war.

A tiny fraction of that amount could give us unlimited school facilities. Another fraction could provide a better life for all the needy of the world. Is that too much to hope for in exchange for giving up a little of our sovereignty—that pertaining to the ability or decision to wage war? I don't think so.

I believe the revision of the United Nations Charter should give that body all the necessary powers to regulate all matters that heretofore have been settled by war. With such assurances that we won't have future wars mankind can get on with the business of providing a better life for the whole world. I feel that this can only be brought about by a system of law and order on the international level, which means the United Nations must be given certain powers of enforcement that it does not have now.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Charles Lanphier, Wauwatosa Senior High School, Milwaukee, student in the Federalist group. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES LANPHIER, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MR. LANPHIER. As you said, I am Charles Lanphier, a senior at Wauwatosa High School. My address is Box 398, Waukesha, Wis. I officially represent 34 members of the Student Federalists Club of our school, all of whom have studied the United Nations Charter. Hundreds of other students in our school agree with us in varying degrees.

We are not interested in tinkering with the United Nations Charter. We are interested in making such revisions in the charter which will make the United Nations able to create peace and maintain peace even unto the year 2000. We are, therefore, interested in giving it the powers of a limited government, a government that can enact, interpret, and enforce world laws applicable to individuals as well as nations.

We proposed the following abbreviated blueprint:

A constitution should be written which defines the powers and duties of the United Nations. It must guarantee local autonomy in local, State, and National affairs, thus making it Federal.

LAWMAKING BODY BASED ON DIRECT ELECTIONS AND PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

The General Assembly should be revised into a lawmaking body. Its members should be elected directly by the people wherever possible as soon as possible.

The 1-nation-1-vote idea should be replaced by a more equitable system. We suggest that there be two branches of the legislature, one based on literate population and the other having one vote per nation.

The laws it passes must be effective on individuals as well as nations. Some of its powers must be:

1. Control of manufacture and sale of weapons of mass destruction.
2. Limit national armies to internal police forces.
3. Taxation.
4. Maintain an army to protect against aggression from without or riots from within.

CHANGES IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council should be made into an executive body.

The veto power should be eliminated. Action could be based on the affirmative vote of any 7 of the 11.

Its duty would be to enforce the laws passed by the General Assembly.

It should be able to recruit its own police force and international bureau of investigation, independent of national government. Perhaps civil-service tactics could be used.

It should have the power to arrest individuals who have violated world laws and bring them to court, without asking for consent from the local, State or National governments.

EXPANSION OF WORLD COURT

The International Court of Justice should expand into a world Court:

It should interpret laws.

It should have the power to try individual criminals. To illustrate, if the League of Nations had possessed this power, Hitler would have been arrested, tried, and punished in the 1930's, thus making World War II and the murdering of 20 million people unnecessary.

We suggest no revisions in the Secretariat, Economic and Social Council, or the Trusteeship Council. No doubt some changes would be necessary if our suggested revisions in the other three branches were made. Such changes would be routine.

We realize that some people might label our suggestions as visionary. But we believe that the seriousness of our present-day crisis demands that we take drastic measures. We believe that that invention and stock piling of the A-bomb and the H-bomb have made it suicidal to permit the nations to drift into another world war. We

believe in the logic of George Washington when in the United States Constitutional Convention he said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair * * *."

We believe that President Eisenhower's proposal for international control of atomic energy cannot become a reality unless the United Nations is given the powers of a limited world government. We believe in democratic government here at home—why not extend it to the world level. The job we propose will not be easy, but it will be a lot easier than to suffer an atomic world war.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, young man.

Next, Mr. E. T. Neubauer of La Crosse, Wis. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF E. T. NEUBAUER, LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. NEUBAUER. Senator Wiley, it is a great pleasure to be here with your committee.

I am E. T. Neubauer, of La Crosse, a mechanical engineer speaking as a private citizen.

The main reason I have a great interest in this subject is the fact that during World War II and shortly thereafter, I spent 5 years helping, in a small way at least, to bring about this horrible destruction known as atomic energy.

I want you people to realize at the conclusion of the war we saw the atom bomb developed which multiplied the destructive power of the biggest block buster at that time by almost 1,500 times. Since then the H-bomb has been developed to multiply that atom bomb destructive power between 600 and 700 times. It is a fact that the H-bomb can be tailored to fit any city in the world. Mankind can now incapacitate any city with one crew, one plane, and one bomb. In other words, the largest bombs of 1944 have been multiplied in destructive power 1 million times in 10 short years. Never before in human history has destructive power ever increased at that rate and since we could knock out any city in the world, probably never again will it multiply by that amount. This should be a definite signal that mankind must seek international cooperation for the elimination of war. There is no other choice.

ELIMINATING THE TERM ENEMY STATE

In this great desire for peace, there are many minds seeking this international organization so urgently that the expedient accomplishment of such an organization is put ahead of fundamental principle. That is the point upon which I wish to dwell. Let's take a few examples, and I am going to skip some of the written discussion for the sake of expediency. Article 53 mentions enemies and section 2 of that article reads as follows:

The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this article applies to any state which during the second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Thus, according to the United Nations Charter, Germany, Italy, and Japan are held enemies of mankind to this day and will continue so until the Charter is revised. In a trillion-dollar war we defeated

Hitler and the racial prejudice for which he stood, and now we have a Charter containing national prejudice—racial or national prejudice are equal in the sight of God. The spirit of Hitler cannot be defeated by carrying on the very things he represented. No people, no race or nationality is our enemy or a permanent enemy of mankind. The United Nations Charter must, therefore, be corrected so that this principle of human dignity is not abrogated in a single article or paragraph of the entire Charter. Similarly, article 107, which I will not read for the sake of expediency, states that Russia, for example, in the occupied territory of Eastern Germany can do as it pleases and the United Nations under its own Charter can do nothing about it.

Now, nearly 2,000 years ago, mankind was given a beautiful lesson. "No man can serve two masters." That lesson holds today and was vividly demonstrated 30 years ago when the League of Nations proclaimed a beautifully humanitarian document known as the Covenant of the League of Nations but tied to it a treaty of revenge—Versailles. On such sand was that house built and when the storm came, it fell. If the present United Nations insists on maintaining its house on such sands it, too, will fall if it is not corrected in time, and I hope, Senator Wiley, your committee will be successful in making an effort to correct it.

NO ABRIDGMENT OF CONSTITUTION OR BILL OF RIGHTS

I want to see a world organization to preserve peace. But to do so it must provide the very important function of protecting the internal constitution of all member nations. It must protect the Constitution of the United States of America in its entirety as this is the greatest document for human conduct written into law in existence today. [Applause.] In human decency and dignity it is surpassed only by the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights also contains some dangerous statements:

Article 29, section 3:

These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

This could be interpreted so as to deny me the right to speak for Charter revision.

Article 30 states:

Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any state, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

This could deny me the right to make an organized effort toward such revision. Both of these could be corrected by the addition of "by force or violence."

Compare these to our Bill of Rights:

Congress shall make no law respecting in establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

This spirit of freedom must become part of the United Nations before the American people can be asked to give allegiance to it.

SELF-DETERMINATION CLAUSE

Article 1, section 2, of the Charter states:

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

Where has the United Nations carried out the self-determination of any people since its inception? It is about time we made it mandatory for the United Nations to carry out this pronouncement of its own Charter so that it may demonstrate its sincerity by deeds as well as words.

Also, the United Nations must proclaim one set of principles in its Charter which holds all members responsible to an equal degree. All members must be responsible to and carry out these principles if they are to remain members in good standing, else the respect for the Charter will die. We cannot have one set of rules for the Communist world and another for the democracies.

To speak more frankly, it is time to revise and simplify the Charter so that the average person can understand what is said—revise it on the fundamental principles of all freedom-loving peoples. Then, and only then, can it expect the allegiance of the majority and thus draw strength and permanence from such allegiance.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Neubauer.

I see we have another substitute here, Miss Grace Livesey in place of Mrs. R. B. Brinsmader. From Milwaukee, I presume?

Miss LIVESEY. No; Madison, Wis.

The CHAIRMAN. Madison, thank you.

STATEMENT OF MISS GRACE LIVESEY, MADISON, WIS.

Miss LIVESEY. Good afternoon, Senator Wiley and Senator Gillette.

I am Grace Livesey of Madison, Wis., and Mrs. R. B. Brinsmader has given me permission to speak in her place this afternoon.

I am chairman of For America Club, and I express their sentiments.

NO LEGISLATIVE, TAX OR POLICE POWER FOR THE U. N.

We believe the United Nations Charter should be revised to specify that no legislative powers should be given to the United Nations since such powers self-evidently intrude upon the constitutional rights of American citizens and the autonomy of the free, law-abiding members of the United Nations.

We believe the United Nations should never ask or be given the power to tax. The power to tax is the power to destroy. We heard Justice Roberts say over a national network that taxation would be levied by the United Nations according to ability to pay. Since no wild flight of imagination would make us believe the Soviets would share the tax burden and most of Western Europe would have to use Marshall Plan funds if they paid this, leaves the United States of America carrying the entire load. By this curious concept, the United States of America could so be reduced to the poverty of the most underprivileged nations without helping raise the standards of these nations except temporarily.

The United Nations should never ask or be given an international army or so-called police force. The tremendous army required to police the millions of the earth's population would create such terrifying power potentials placed in the hands of a relatively small group of people as to leave an unarmed world defenseless. The United Nations could and would become the cruelest despot the world has ever known. Possession of this vast and unchallenged power would give ruthless men in every part of the world the irresistible urge to control that power. The stargazers would look unhappily from their ivory towers and wonder what had happened to their dream of a free, prosperous, peaceful world.

THE U. N. AS A MORAL FORCE FOR GOOD

We believe the strength of the United Nations should be the strength of a great moral force for good. A place where nations of the world might arbitrate disagreements and arrive at some degree of mutual understanding. Surely it is wicked for the United Nations to demand the armed might it deplores when in the hands of individual nations.

If the present membership of the United Nations is so divided as to make agreement by moral suasion impossible that defect cannot be remedied by putting the only armed force in the world at the disposal of this morally heterogeneous aggregation. As David Lawrence said in the March 15, 1954, U. S. News and World Report, "Morality cannot be legislated."

It is truly astonishing to hear the United World Federalists wasting time and breath on a proposal for our Nation to lead in disarming and submitting to international inspection. America has already proposed this and the Soviet Union has emphatically rejected this proposal. To believe that the Soviet Union will ever tolerate this or any other intrusion upon the autonomy of the Russians or their satellites is dangerously delusional. Of course Russia has no objection to having the United States of America take the lead in disarming if we have enough citizens stupid or treasonable enough to advocate the destruction of America by this relatively simple device. The Security Council should always have the power to veto granting membership to aggressor nations who have proven to be enemies of world security.

I thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. Walter Matzke, Wauwatosa Senior High School, Milwaukee, instructor. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF WALTER MATZKE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. MATZKE. Senator Wiley and members of your committee—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you look after my grandson out there? I have a grandson out there in Wauwatosa.

Mr. MATZKE. What is his name?

The CHAIRMAN. Wilding.

Mr. MATZKE. I will take care of him. I teach mathematics so I will try to get him to learn.

I have studied the United Nations Charter as it relates to the questions of maintaining peace. I have the highest regard for the purposes set forth in the preamble, but much of the rest of the charter reveals that the nations have not given the organization any real power to fulfill those purposes.

To my thinking, the only way the war system can be abolished is to substitute in its place the machinery for ironing out the frictions and differences which develop between nations and peoples as they live side by side in our complex international society. The only machinery I know of that can resolve such problems is government.

LEGISLATIVE POWERS IN INTERNATIONAL FIELDS FOR THE U. N.

Therefore I suggest that the proposals the United States offers to the 1955 revisionary conference should be in the direction which would give the United Nations the powers of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world laws. Such powers should definitely be restricted to matters that are international in scope. The nations, states, and cities should be guaranteed autonomy in all other matters. There would be no secession.

The General Assembly should be changed into a lawmaking body. There should be 2 branches, 1 having population representation, and the other having 1 vote per nation. Assemblymen should be elected by the people they represent as soon as technicalities permit. Control of weapons of mass destruction, limiting of national armed forces, inspections, and taxation are a few of the areas in which it should have the power to legislate.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL AS THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Security Council should become the executive branch. Its duties would be to enforce the laws made by the General Assembly. It should have its own self-recruited police force. It should arrest individual citizens who violate world laws. The veto should be abandoned, action being based on seven affirmative votes.

World courts would be necessary to interpret laws and to give trials to those arrested. The International Court of Justice could be expanded into such a court.

I hope Congress will appropriate adequate funds so that your committee can organize and plan for the 1955 United Nations Charter revision. Let's not make it too little, too late. The world must be governed now. The inhabitants of the earth cannot afford to risk the results of permitting A-bombs, H-bombs, cobalt bombs, or bacteriological weapons to be in the hands of trigger-happy, power-seeking national leaders.

If the United States seeks these revisions in the United Nations, it is entirely possible that all but the Soviet bloc would go along in the immediate future. I believe that sooner or later the members of the Soviet bloc would also seek admission on terms existing within the revised United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

Our next witness is Mrs. Carl A. Kolb. If you will just have a chair, I want to say that my associate here must also leave to catch a plane.

I am going to ask him if he wants to give you a farewell message, and after that we will give him a good hand.

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I assure you that I will stay well within the 5-minute rule. It won't be over 3 minutes.

There are 2 or 3 matters that I wanted to mention that I think should be mentioned in connection with the developments of this conference. Most of the witnesses who have appeared before us have discussed the veto power. Some suggested that it be abandoned entirely; most suggested it be modified; and some few insisting it be retained.

BACKGROUND OF THE VETO PROVISION

I think it would not be out of order if I mention briefly some of the steps that came up in connection with the adoption of this charter.

As one of the witnesses suggested, the United States refused to go into the League of Nations, many thinking that as a result of our refusal to cooperate, the League of Nations proved ineffective.

So as World War II was drawing to what we hoped would be a close, it was suggested among our allies that instead of waiting until after the war we throw into gear machinery that might bring about cooperation among the Allied Nations for world peace and security.

There was an assertion made by our allies that the Americans would not go along. Consequently, Senator Connally, who was the chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee at that time, offered the resolution in 1943 which committed us to cooperation with the rest of the world.

That passed by a vote of 85 to 5. At that time we were anticipating an attack on the Normandy coast. Russia was an ally of ours. We knew we could not beat the Central Powers on two fronts. There was fear that Russia might make a separate peace with Germany.

Secretary of State Hull journeyed to Moscow and brought back the Moscow Declaration, which was an assurance that we would stay in a military effort until its culmination, and also that we would participate in an international organization for peace, provided that such an instrument was drawn up for consideration before the actual end of hostilities.

The result was the formation of a committee which I mentioned this morning, composed of Senators Vandenberg, George, and Burkley, Senator Connally whom I mentioned, the chairman, and your great Senator, since deceased, Senator La Follette.

We put this veto power in and every member of that committee knew of its danger, but everyone was convinced that we could not get anything through the United States Senate that did not maintain for the United States a veto power. That is why it is in there. That is why it has been a rock on which this ship of cooperative effort has been repeatedly stopped.

PURPOSE OF SUBCOMMITTEE IS NOT WORLD GOVERNMENT

The second thing I wanted to mention so briefly is that there was evidence today and it is evidenced in correspondence that many people think that the effort of this committee, under this great chairman here, is designed to transform the United Nations Charter into a world government plan.

Now, we are not excluding any suggestions—world federalists or any other—but we are not here for the purpose of, and neither is our work concerned with, changing the United Nations Charter into a constitution of the world.

I say we are not excluding anything, I want to assure you, just as strongly as my colleague did before he went, of just one other thing before I say goodbye to you:

NO MONOPOLY ON PATRIOTISM

This is democracy working. Democracy, when it works, is the crystallization of viewpoint that comes from varied judgments. It is our belief, as members of a representative government, that out of that controversy of debate there will be crystallized a judgment that will be sound. Consequently, we expect and we always will have, I am sure, controversial viewpoints, but I want to leave this thought with you:

Let nobody, nobody, no organization, think that they have a monopoly on patriotism. (Applause.) I have seen some evidence of that here, and I make that by way of criticism. Here is my Republican friend and I am a Democrat. We differ on basic matters, but I know that he respects my viewpoint, and I know that I deeply respect his, and out of that we have the government of the United States.

And as I have listened to these people, I want to thank you sincerely for your spirit of cooperation and your great help to the work we are trying to do.

I will close with this: As I have listened to these young people, from the young people at the high school age to the older people up through the different gradations present their viewpoints, you know, I was thrilled, and the words of George Cohan came to me:

I am no cranky, hanky-panky,

I am a dead square, honest Yankee

And mighty proud of our old flag that flies for Uncle Sam.

Though I don't believe in raving,

Every time I see it waving

There is a thrill runs up my back that makes me glad I am what I am.

And I was thrilled here today. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. I am, indeed, sorry that my associate has to leave, but you understand after hearing him why so many Republicans vote for him. (Laughter.)

Our next witness is Mrs. Carl A. Kolb, Delavan, Wis., representing the Methodist Women's Society of Christian Service of the Wisconsin Conference. Glad to see you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CARL A. KOLB, DELAVAN, WIS.

Mrs. KOLB. Thank you, Senator. I am the Christian social relations secretary for the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Wisconsin Conference, of the Methodist Church. However, I am speaking for myself because our Wisconsin conference women have not yet made a statement on the revision of the charter.

However, we have been reading and studying about the United Nations since its beginning, and in fact, as Senator Wiley knows, we had observers of our Women's Society at the United Nations since its

beginning and in San Francisco. This summer we are having a series of work shops, concentrating especially on the revisions of the charter. So I want to make a statement today on maybe only three or four points of my own personal belief, and I hope these are specific enough to be worth considering.

HIGH LEVEL DISARMAMENT TALKS

First of all, it seems to me that now is the time for continued high level talks on disarmament, especially after the statements we have read, not only from the United States and other countries that we consider on our side of the fence, but also from Russia.

It seems to me that probably, as two or three others have suggested here today, that the Disarmament Commission might be given more prestige and more power and more value even on the side of Russia, if it were raised in status probably to an organ. Maybe my thinking may be slightly awry, but it seems to me we are all concerned about peaceful uses of atomic energy, and I would like to see the organization that began—I think its beginnings were about in 1950—that is now called "The European Council of Nuclear Research" to be broadened and widened in membership.

It is European nations only now, and that that body that is doing research for peaceful uses of atomic energy be a wider organ, and that that organ, or that council, work with the Disarmament Commission, so that the two are working hand in hand to disarmament. And then what are you going to do with materials?

It seems to me the scientists have developed something here which is beyond most of our comprehension, and it can help if the scientists work with such a commission.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Two more points, and then I will quit. I think it is almost miraculous what the Social and Economic Council has been able to do with UNICEF, WHO, and especially the work of the technical assistance under the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Mr. Wiley, I would like to see, if possible, our Senate help see that the United Nations has more money for those organs of the Economic and Social Council, and that they get the personnel, the experts, to do the work because I think in that field we have our greatest hope for building peace.

Point number three, article 71. I think nobody has mentioned that today. I would like to see that left intact because this is the article that provides the opportunity for self-governing organizations to observe and to interpret to its members the work of the United Nations.

Also, it brings out the point of view that those particular organizations have on which they are competent to speak.

And lastly, I think we cannot expect too much revision in this first charter review, and I think we need to be realistic as Americans and not demand all the wonderful things we have suggested here today.

I think we can realize that the work of the United Nations has been wonderful. It is miraculous what has been achieved in this short time, and that the full potentialities of the previous charter have not been used.

Let's give it an opportunity to continue to work.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The next witness is Mr. Burton Perrigo, representing the American Citizens League of Milwaukee. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF BURTON PERRIGO, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. PERRIGO. Mr. Chairman and friends: I am Burton Perrigo, a lawyer, representing the American Citizens League, and I am also appearing individually and as chairman of the Waukesha County Republican Statutory Committee.

I want to say at the outset that I will not take 5 minutes. I believe in the United Nations with reservations. I believe that the United Nations should, for the time being, possibly for the next 5 or 10 years, be on sort of probation. There is ample reason for that. Our experience has not always been to our liking with the United Nations.

DANGERS OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

There is agitation now to revise the charter of the United Nations, and many seem to feel that the only way we can have an effective United Nations is to have a real world government. We want no superworld government, I think for reasons which need not even be gone into.

A world government, a supergovernment, would ruin us nationally and individually and would not stop war.

It would have the power of taxation. It would have to have an international police force. All of those things we would be rightfully fearful of.

USING OUR VETO

Now as to how the United Nations can be made effective without becoming a supergovernment, I feel that we can fight fire with fire. Russia has used the veto. She has used her Iron Curtain to keep us out, to keep us in the dark as to what was going on in Russia. We could do likewise with the Communist-dominated countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Iron Curtain was really imposed to keep the people in Russia from knowing what a good world there was outside.

Mr. PERRIGO. That is true enough, but I think this is an economic battle between the East and the West primarily, and if we were to boycott or to ostracize socially all Communist countries, or let us say all bad countries, that were in or out of the United Nations, practically put an Iron Curtain around them, place an embargo on all trade with them, I think it would not be long before they who are insufficient unto themselves would come knocking at our door begging for admittance. It would then be our turn to ask for appeasement rather than granting it.

I feel that the United Nations was at least allegedly created as a kind of an honor society, where people could discuss their international problems. I think it should remain there.

As I have said before, I think that we can shame or embargo these people into behaving. Under no circumstances must we ever

give up the veto, whether we have used it or not to date. We should never commit ourselves to say that we will not use it on the admission of Red China or on any other question. Never, never should we lose the right to say "No."

Thank you, very much.

(The full prepared statement of Mr. Perrigo is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF BURTON PERRIGO, LAWYER, APPEARING INDIVIDUALLY, FOR THE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE, AND AS CHAIRMAN OF THE WAUKESHA COUNTY REPUBLICAN STATUTORY COMMITTEE

Complaint is made that the United Nations is in need of strengthening, that it must be a supreme or world government, in order to have everlasting peace on earth; that it has been helpless in the face of opposition, and must have a police force to inspect and to carry out policy. Theoretically the United Nations was not so created, but rather it was to be a forum where the nations of the world would be brought into direct and continuing contact with one another. The member nations were to have sovereign equality with each other and were to settle international disputes by peaceful means, so as not to endanger international peace, security, and justice.

Everyone wants peace and justice for all. But is peace so desirable as to be worth any price? American liberty, justice, and equality are far more than mere visions. They are guaranteed to us by our United States Constitution. The United Nations does not propose to give us even that which we already have. It is provided in the Covenant on Human Relations that all the people in all the world shall have the same rights and privileges, and those rights and privileges are in the Covenant on Human Relations and not the same as in the United States Constitution. Under the United Nations our rights would be lowered to the level of the world standard rather than being used as the standard of the world.

It is not my contention that the United Nations should be abolished. It is clearly evident it needs charter changes to be the "honor society" it was originally purported to be. But under no circumstances should it ever be a super or world government.

Under world government it would be impossible to end war. We do not want war. But real Americans do not want "peace at any price." Six percent of the world population is in the United States. World government would have to be democratic and would be based on majority rule. The "have nots" would easily overwhelm the "haves" in all elections, whether it be a selective service draft, taxation, or any other question of supergovernmental activity. There is no limit to the plunder and sabotage that could legally be practiced on the people of the United States under a superworld democracy. Our economic well-being would be completely destroyed; our laborers' rights would be wiped out and production taken over by cheap foreign labor. The small manufacturer and small businessman would be wiped out, our rich would be liquidated. We would have nothing to say about our taxation, our production, our right to police ourselves, or defend ourselves, and would be reduced to slavery. There would be no tariff and no immigration barriers. Under any adequate world government the "have nots" would have and use the right of equality of access and opportunity for all the people of the world. If you question that, remember the United Nations General Assembly in Paris, December 10, 1948, adopted a "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" without a dissenting vote.

Under world government we could not be in control of our own affairs. The superdemocracy, of which we would be only 6 percent, would lay down the rules for us to follow in regard to immigration. We would be required by taxation to do what now we do voluntarily. We have been generous to a fault with the rest of the world. We have shared our wealth. We have given away since the end of World War II more than \$53 billion in foreign aid, 50 percent more than the value of all the cattle, hogs, mules, sheep, and chickens we have. Every family in the United States has had taken from it a small fortune in taxes for European relief. We determined that amount and we can still determine how much we'll continue to give, and the duration of our generosity. Under world government our 6 percent minority would be forever outvoted on any question of wealth, distribution, opportunity, access, immigration, personal activity, and nation, family and personal freedom.

The nation which would have the most to lose from the edicts of world government would be the United States. They would ruin us. We should not be opposed to the United States granting access to its resources, markets, and opportunities if deemed advisable, but remember, it is one thing to invite a guest and something quite different to be ordered. The court ordering us to support the world would not be an American court but a world court. Why should we consent to foreign regulation? That is loss of sovereignty.

World government advocates make it look like they are only interested in ending for all time, war, and that political, legal, social, monetary, and economic institutions would stay as they are. Nothing could be more false. World government, to work, would have to be world government, i. e., total government. It would have a single monetary standard, universal money, and of course, worldwide inflation is the monetary aspect, permanent and unlimited—the perpetual sharing of our abundance with the deficit areas of the world. The social or economic aspect is the leveling down of Americans and the leveling up of the rest of the world.

There is only one escape from the ruinous taxation and slavery of world government and that is secession, which would mean war against the world. Once world government really gets established, neither America nor any other state would be able to wage such a war, as we would be completely disarmed in the early stages of the super United Nations and would have no effective military force. In fact, we would be subjected to alien armies and alien secret police, as the super United Nations would of necessity take over the police power everywhere. With it would go the prerogative of United Nations courts trying any citizen or any American official on criminal charges such as at Nuremberg and Tokyo, not under United States law, but under laws passed by a majority of representatives of all the people of all the world and undoubtedly acts which are now not illegal in the United States would be declared high crimes under the United Nations. One would probably be declared guilty of treason, punishable by death or life imprisonment, even for criticizing the super United Nations. Every vestige of our constitutionally guaranteed freedom would be surrendered—never to be regained.

World government would bankrupt the United States. At present we pay the greater share of the cost of the United Nations. Under a superstate we would pay far more. Figure out the cost, using as a base the cost of the countries we now police. The price is prohibitive, and it would be up to the United States to pay. The only other power capable of creating a superworld government is Soviet Russia. An American formula would be as unacceptable to Russia as Russia's would be to us. That could lead to war—the United States against the Iron Curtain countries, and possibly more. Thereby, both countries—16 percent of the world population would be bankrupt and eliminated as a world factor. That leaves 84 percent of the world's population still intact and wars would still occur.

The veto power in the Security Council to date has served only to frustrate the Western Powers. We have practically surrendered our right to use it while Russia has by veto kept out 14 applicants for membership which would have been friendly to the United States. So long as Russia continues to use the veto in that manner, and so long as we refuse to do likewise, there can be no new members admitted except by surrender or appeasement on the part of the Western World. To admit Red China would be appeasement and surrender of all hope.

A superworld government would control atomic power and spell the end of national sovereignty. One cannot be loyal to a super world government and remain loyal to the United States of America. There is no similarity between such action and the formation of our own United States. We must keep the United Nations a forum for peaceful settlement of national differences, with honor, or withdraw from membership therein. We cannot continue to ignore our veto power, to appease, or to contemplate doing honorable business with countries and peoples without honor. We must remain American or perish.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. [Applause.]

Next, Mrs. Harold Levine, speaking for Mrs. E. A. Bernstein of Milwaukee, National Council of Jewish Women.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HAROLD LEVINE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. LEVINE. Mr. Wiley, and members of the committee, the Milwaukee Section, National Council of Jewish Women, wishes me to thank the committee for the opportunity to reaffirm its belief in the United Nations as an instrument of peace.

We recommend a reexamination of the present Charter of the United Nations to find new interpretations that will open the way for further agreement between the nations.

We believe that the structure of the United Nations can remain flexible and we urge that all avenues of agreement should be even more fully explored.

We believe that the success of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and promoting the solution of economic, social and humanitarian problems of all peoples, depends on the extent to which the member states use its facilities, and carry out its recommendations when these transcend the special interests of the member nations.

We, therefore, urge the United States to continue to participate fully in the activities and agencies of the United Nations; to support, strengthen and implement their decisions; and whenever possible, to channel its foreign policy through the United Nations.

We urge that the United States support efforts toward the transfer of sovereignty by member nations to the United Nations in those fields of activity where concerted international action can advance peace and human welfare.

We urge fuller use of the instruments provided by the United Nations such as the World Court, the Peace Observation Commission, and the Good Offices Commission, to name a few.

We advocate the establishment of United Nations Armed Forces as provided in the United Nations Charter; the regulation and reduction of other Armed Forces throughout the world, and reduction of the conventional and atomic armaments of individual nations, with the establishment of an effective system of international control and inspection.

We support the present economic and military measures of the United States and cooperating nations which are necessary to strengthen the defenses of the free world.

We urge bringing all non-self-governing territories under the administration of the United Nations, raising their social, economic and educational levels with the view to eventual independence.

We recommend that the United States place its ablest men in key positions in our United Nations delegation.

The committee recommends, too, universal membership in the United Nations, as essential. We favor the relinquishing of the veto on the question of membership in the United Nations and the pacific settlement of disputes.

Thank you, Senator.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Our next speaker is Mrs. Hobart Olson of Milwaukee. Glad to see you, Mrs. Olson. I have seen you in Washington.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HOBART OLSON, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mrs. OLSON. Thank you, Senator Wiley, for the opportunity of so doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mrs. OLSON. Senator Wiley, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that charter revision should follow lines of clarification of the present charter not to enlarge along visionary rather than practical lines of potential world government, and in view of the very sincere and heartening remark-pledge of Senator Mansfield this morning, may I state that some of my further remarks are based on human uses to which any advantage or opening can be termed.

For instance, one of the premises on which world security was based in the beginning in 1914 was upon the continued cooperation of the big powers after the pressure of war was once removed, and where is Russia today, an aggressor nation in a cold war.

China has turned from nationalism to communism; Great Britain and France are following their own ways which do not necessarily lead to complete united cooperation.

I feel the world needs to reach an understanding of mutually acceptable moral codes, laws, and economic and political standards, before an enlargement of any world government would be at all practical.

Russia today, to quote Secretary Dulles, regards law as a means whereby those in power obtain their objective while the other two-thirds of the world regard law as man's effort to apply moral principles to human affairs.

REMOVING AMBIGUITIES FROM THE CHARTER

I understand that some of our international law today is on a politically expedient basis rather than any other basis, and may I point as one example the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of the 3d of November 1950, the legality of which has been questioned by Prof. Hans Kelsen, professor of international law, University of California; also by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain, in his article on the 26th of October 1953 in the Wall Street Journal. To quote Professor Kelsen:

The United Nations Charter is one of the most equivocal instruments ever drafted in the field of international law.

He further substantiates that with a discussion of articles 10 and 11 in the United Nations articles.

To brief that he states that article 10 is superseded by 11, article 10 permitting the General Assembly be empowered to recommend armed force by article 11, stating that the General Assembly has no such power.

As another potential of confusion that needs to be cleared up, may I point to paragraph 132 of the 1951 report of the Collective Measures Committee of the United Nations itself. I quote that paragraph:

In all these cases (application of economic sanctions, provision of arms and other material aids to states which are victims of aggression) the respective roles of the United Nations and the individual governments are by no means clear. This constitutes a delicate problem requiring further study by the United Nations.

And Mrs. Pandit said:

We greeted the United Nations Charter with tears in our eyes, today we laugh at it.

Why would she make such a remark if she were not aware of legalistic inequalities and existing contradictions?

TREATY-RATIFICATION PROCESS

As a housewife, I am aware of the door-to-door technique of salesmen which I am sometimes faced with. It is a policy to put the foot in the door, and thereby, perhaps, gain entry certainly, if not time and attention, and it seems to me that perhaps this same technique can be applied to treaty ratification.

During the time of ratification, we are told the treaty will not affect a change in the constitutional powers of the executive branch. Later, the supremacy clause in our Constitution is used as a means of encroaching upon constitutional provisions designed to protect against arbitrary power.

For example, on the 16th of March of this year, Mr. Dulles said a United States President under the uncontrolled supremacy doctrine has authority without consulting Congress to put the American people into war any time and anywhere. This was said in spite of the assurances which were given back in 1949 when the North Atlantic Treaty was being considered, that that treaty would not increase or decrease Presidential powers.

I maintain there is no lock on our international door today, because of the treaty supremacy clause as it was rejected by Congress, the Bricker amendment having failed by one vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you are mistaken about that. The Bricker amendment was defeated by a great majority. It was the George amendment that was defeated by one vote.

Mrs. OLSON. Thank you for the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Not only that, but you will find out if you read the record that Mr. Bricker defeated his own amendment by simply saying on the floor of the Senate he never was in favor of the "which" clause which is 60 percent of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mrs. OLSON. That is right, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. We did not come here to discuss that, and I am sorry I interrupted you, but there have been quite a few misstatements here today, and I shall have to make a few statements of fact when we conclude with the witnesses like the one I just gave you now.

Now is there anything further?

Mrs. OLSON. May I ask, sir, why the United States should not have had the same standing as all other nations in the United Nations with regard to internal security? Our treaty supremacy clause might not permit that. I call your attention to one or two other bits of comments such as the Genocide Treaty, and the Latvian colonel now in the United States who warns us not to give up our sidearms as they did in Latvia for it is the first move through which potential victims—

The CHAIRMAN. Don't start out with the idea that the Genocide Treaty is a treaty. It is still locked up in the Foreign Relations Committee and has never come out.

Mrs. OLSON. And never been brought to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. You know what the Secretary of State has said on the subject, but let us not pursue this course. You have already had 6 minutes and if you don't mind, I will call the next witness.

Mrs. OLSON. Yes, sir. Thank you. [Applause.]

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Olson is as follows:)

TESTIMONY OF MRS. HOBART OLSON, HOUSEWIFE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

I believe charter revision should follow lines of clarification of the present charter to make the United Nations the substantial foundation for world peace which it is not today. I am not in favor of enlarging its powers along any visionary lines of world government. There seems presently too little regard for the practical application of the U. N. in a real, not an ideal, world . . . where Russia exists as an aggressor nation in cold war, where China has turned from nationalism to communism and where individual interests in Britain and France cause them to follow the paths leading to their own advantages rather than those of mutual benefit. In 1915 the charter was drawn up assuming a continued coalition between the above-mentioned nations after the pressure of war was removed.

Until the world has reached an understanding of mutually acceptable moral codes, laws, and political and economic standards we do not want so radical a step as world government under the U. N. What good would world government do in a world where "Russia regards law as a means whereby those in power obtain their objective, while the other two-thirds of the world regard law as man's effort to apply moral principles to human affairs" (Mr. Dulles January 18, 1954, before Charter Review Subcommittee). Some of our international law so far has been on a politically expedient basis. Little progress has been made under U. N. article 13 (1) (a) which calls for further study and recommendations to the U. N. I call attention to the "uniting for peace" resolution of November 3, 1960, the legality of which has been questioned by Prof. Hans Kelsen, professor of law, University of California, and by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain in the Wall Street Journal October 26, 1953.

To quote further Mr. Kelsen: "The U. N. Charter is one of the most equivocal instruments ever drafted in the field of international law." He points out that the loose construction of the charter permits the superseding of article 10, under which the General Assembly is empowered to recommend armed force by article 11, which says the General Assembly has no such power. (In article What Happened to the Security Council? appearing in the New Reader.) These are mutually contradictory rulings which would require interpretation before the "uniting for peace" resolution could be given serious weight.

As a further example of present confusion in the U. N. Charter I quote paragraph 132 of the 1951 report of the Collective Measures Committee of the U. N. itself: "In all these cases (application of economic sanctions, provision of arms and other material aids to states which are victims of aggression) the respective roles of the U. N. and the individual governments are by no means clear. This constitutes a delicate problem, requiring further study by the U. N." I quote these two examples of charter uncertainties to point out my initial premise of the needs of clarification of the present charter.

I am told Mme. L'Andit has said: "We greeted the U. N. Charter with tears in our eyes, today we laugh at it." Why would she make such a remark if she were not aware of legalistic inequalities and existing contradictions?

The favorite technique of door-to-door salesmen is to get a foot in the door first, as housewives know. Hence, housewives keep the chain lock on when answering. This same foot-in-the-door technique seems practical in treaty ratification. During the time of ratification we are told the treaty will not affect a change in the constitutional powers of the executive branch. Later the supremacy clause in our Constitution is used as a means of encroaching upon constitutional provisions designed to protect against arbitrary power.

For example, on March 18 of this year, Mr. Dulles said a United States President under the uncontrolled supremacy doctrine has authority without consulting Congress to put the American people into war anytime and anywhere. This was said in spite of the assurance in 1949 while the North Atlantic Treaty was being considered that that treaty would not increase or decrease preat-

dential powers. Is not this foot-in-the-door thinking? And remember the United States does not have a safeguard of a lock on our international door because of the treaty supremacy clause in our Constitution. And when a lock was suggested the Congress rejected it. The Bricker amendment lost by one vote. Is this being realistic? I mention this unique constitutional situation of the United States in a charter revision consideration since the U. N. Charter has treaty status, and no matter what protestations of good faith are made during treaty acceptance later interpretation can change it. Practically speaking, possession is nine-tenths of the law. Why should the United States not have the same standing as all other nations in the U. N. in regard to internal security? Our treaty supremacy clause does not permit.

If interpretation cannot alter intent then why do I read the testimony in the Congressional Record of Dr. Marek Stanislaw Korowicz before Mr. Velde's Committee on Un-American Activities, September 24, 1953, which states: "The organization of the U. N. is considered as one of the most important platforms for Soviet propaganda in the world. I wish to underline the following comment: Not only Russia but its satellites attach a primary importance that the members of their bloc of satellite powers maintain their relations with the Western World. It is emphasized at all times that the acts of real democracy, socialist democracy, that they seek to direct channel over the heads of their government to the great masses of the United States and the other western countries, and the United Nations Organization offers a parliamentary platform to the Soviet politicians and from this platform they may preach to the populations of the entire world and do their subversive propaganda."

Though I offer the above to emphasize other nation's misinterpretation of the U. N., may I add that at the same time I regard the U. N. of infinite service to the free peoples of the world? Because it does give us this very opportunity to hear the thinking of Communist countries and to be forewarned. To be forewarned can be forearmed if we are wise. Also it is a place where differences can be settled amicably.

Further, how about the Latvian colonel now somewhere in this country who is known to have stated that if we Americans were so foolish as to ignore the lessons of captive countries and permit any nation or group of nations to cause us to disarm, then their national crucifixion has been in vain. For would-be conquerors enter softly and take small arms first, then when the victim is helpless to defend himself he is tied to the chariot of the conqueror, as witness Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, East Germany. How can you ignore such practical applications?

The Genocide Treaty, presented during the past administration to the Foreign Relations Committee but never brought to the Senate floor for debate, is another example. Mr. Dulles testifying before the Judiciary Committee against the Bricker amendment said our State Department had no plan to request the adoption of the Genocide Treaty; but only a few months later our United States delegate in the U. N. cast the American vote in support of a resolution calling for a speedy ratification of the Genocide Convention, and because of our treaty supremacy clause this means the setting aside of our United States Constitution. (Art. IV, p. 11 of the Genocide Treaty: "Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in art. III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, or private individuals." This is an example of treaty law affecting the individual.)

How about Mrs. Richard T. Keefe, the wife of the NATO treaty victim, now serving 5 years of hard labor under a French court decision for the illegal possession of a French taxicab? (Could there be a shade of international jealousy reflected in the severity of this sentence?) Our Constitution no longer protects our citizens abroad because of the treaty supremacy clause—and what other country has so many citizens abroad for many reasons as have we?

Let us therefore revise this U. N. Charter to make it clear and specific and understood by all nations agreeing to it, rather than enlarging upon its powers because of the present pressure of fear of war and the atom age.

It is because of hysterical fear and organized propaganda that good citizens are being pushed beyond common sense in their support of presently impractical measures which sound very attractive when considered on the level of abstractions, but let us never supersede our own Constitution, or leave any avenue open through which it can be superseded. The supposed limitations which may be put upon measures of collective security such as a world police force, or world disarmament, may be later misused to our sorrow. Let us squarely face the

fact that today power is the keynote of government in most of the world, and when we lower our barriers and power we offer to others the potential opportunity to tax us to support a world army in proportion to our wealth and the chance to appropriate our property to world government advantages. Gentlemen, if the Nation as a whole had really wanted world government why did 21 states rescind their resolutions for world government when they realized what was being put forth? And why did 7 states reject world government resolutions within the past year and a half.

Historically there is no validity in the hope that peace is necessarily achieved through widening the area of security. Examples are Manchuria and Ethiopia under the old League of Nations and today the Korean war actively participated in by only 10 of the 60 U. N. Nations and with Red China an active participant in this so-called police action. We have proved disastrously that it is just as expensive in lives and material to police an aggressor as it is to be the aggressor himself. President Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy boiled down to this statement: "Tread softly but with a big stick." And in naval operations you have the same practical thought in "the fleet in being" which is a deterrent to a potential aggressor. These policies are practical—they are our own. Let us use the wisdom of years of experience and not allow the burdens of anxieties of the world to become so intolerable that we try to recreate the world in the image of our own wishes (Lawrence H. Smith in House of Representatives Jan. 24, 1950).

I regard the U. N. at the present time in the same position as Mr. Lincoln regarded the Union of his day and end with two quotations from him which seem as applicable to this situation as they were then: "Now we are engaged in a great Civil War testing whether that nation or any other nation so conceived or so dedicated can long endure" (and our concept and our dedication shall no exact parallel in the world today). "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robert G. Vest, on behalf of the Methodist Church of Milwaukee.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. VEST, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. VEST. Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee: We, because of our Christian background, have faith in the United Nations and uphold the ideals it is striving to promulgate.

As college age youth, we recognize the weaknesses and tensions of the United Nations; however, we affirm the necessity of this organization as a means of alleviating the problems that exist among the nations.

We commend the progress made by its specialized agencies. We believe that through the United Nations our country is able to witness to the world our desire to promote the individual rights of men.

In this confused age, we strongly feel that the United Nations is our most effective hope for attaining world peace; and we are optimistic that through this medium we can succeed in obtaining a peaceful and cooperative world.

Therefore, we of the Kenwood branch of the Wesley Foundation of Milwaukee support any revisions necessary to encourage peaceful negotiations among nations.

Our prayers are with you as you approach this task placed before you.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Our next witness is Mr. James P. Buchanan, of Neenah, Wis. Good to see you, sir; good to see your wife, too.

STATEMENT OF JAMES P. BUCHANAN, NEENAH, WIS.

Mr. BUCHANAN. My name is James P. Buchanan. My address is Route 6, Green Bay, Wis. I am employed as assistant treasurer of Marathon Corp. in Menasha. The views which I shall express here today are my personal view on the matter of United Nations Charter revision. I am grateful to your subcommittee for providing this special opportunity for me, and others like me, to present our opinions on this vital matter.

We who work in corporate financial departments are, in general, conservative, in several senses of the word. Our prime function is the conservation of the company's assets. As we struggle to moderate the natural enthusiasm of the sales force, we tend to build within ourselves an increasing resistance to change—a conservative outlook toward all matters.

I, therefore, feel that it is very fitting that I should be here today. I wish to plead for the conservation not only of our company's assets—fixed, liquid, and human—but for the salvation from atomic destruction of all such assets in the United States and all the world.

WASTE OF WAR AND ARMAMENTS

We surely agree that world war III must be avoided. Even if it should not physically destroy the United States, economic collapse would be inevitable. The cost of waging such a war and postwar reconstruction would break our financial back, even if we won the world. The disillusioned survivors might understandably turn to the very doctrines which we fought to destroy.

I don't mean to be a fearmonger. I don't believe that I am lacking in courage. I do believe that even a glance at the history of civilization should be enough to convince us that a bold step is essential to avoid the otherwise inevitable war.

I feel very deeply that our present course must lead to such destruction, unless steps are taken to remove man's ability to wage war. To take these steps is certainly the conservative approach when the alternative is considered.

Even short of such devastation, the economic waste involved in the current armament race is considerable. We all know that a major share of our tax burden is traceable to the cost of past wars and of preparation for future wars.

The diversion of these wasted tax dollars into consumer channels would be a tremendous boost to the standards of living of Americans and all world people.

The new demands for household goods would provide a greater need for productive labor than the released servicemen could provide.

POWERS FOR DISARMAMENT

Because I feel so strongly the importance of disarmament, I believe that certain specific powers must be given to the United Nations at the Charter Review Conference which is scheduled for 1956.

The United Nations has been a positive force in world affairs since its charter was adopted in 1945. It has, however, been limited by that charter in its most vital function—that of settling major international

disputes. Although it can recommend action to nations, it is not in a position to enforce its decisions.

I do not pretend to be an expert in the field of international relations. I have, however, given a good deal of thought and study to this problem, and have reached the conclusion that the United Nations should be given certain specific powers at the time of charter review.

The aim is, of course, the achievement of world peace through universal enforceable disarmament. The powers granted the United Nations must be sufficient to achieve this objective, but otherwise, as limited as possible.

The following is a brief outline of those features which I consider particularly vital:

1. There must first be world law, carefully restricted to matters of international security against war and applicable to individuals.

2. To enforce this law, there must be a world police force consisting of citizens of all nations.

3. The United Nations must have limited power to tax in order to support the police force and finance its other necessary activities.

PRESERVING OUR FREEDOMS

Would such a program destroy our liberty? I think not. We Americans are more concerned with the freedom of the individual than that of the state. We are proud of our country and our system, but primarily because of the freedom it provides. To me, the greatest threat to this personal freedom is the shadow of war.

High taxes restrict our free spending of our earnings. Korea taught us that even a limited war can sharply reduce our choice of action. Most husbands and sons prefer home to an overseas foxhole. Government controls have so warped business incentives that normally intelligent action becomes unwise. The resulting economic inefficiencies were not only unfair to certain segments of our population, but hurtful to our standards of living.

Excessive controls are not compatible with our free economic system. In all phases of our daily life, economic or otherwise, war transfers powers from the individual to the state. The elimination of war by a conference of men mindful of individual freedom must, then, increase this freedom.

I would like to read about five lines from the current issue of *Time*:

The H-bomb's existence requires the United States to put much more strongly the case for international control of atomic weapons. Such control might impair unlimited national sovereignty as the world now knows it. It might imply a measure of world government. But the United States need not flinch at this prospect. Its own political history encourages the chance of a constitutional solution of a force so big that it calls for supranational control.

I would like to file this with my report to the committee.

Some features and implications of these recommendations are not entirely palatable to me, but I feel that they are all necessary for effective and safe world disarmament. I am certainly not anxious to see the birth of another taxing body, for example, even though the total tax burden would be considerably reduced. However, such misgivings seem minor when I ask myself the question: What are the alternatives?

If the United States should announce its desire to work toward the charter modifications outlined here, it would, I believe, give new

hope to the majority of the world's population. In working steadily toward this goal, we would be clearly on the side of the individual, exerting a great force of moral leadership which is so needful.

Thank you. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Next, Mr. Weigt of Baraboo, Wis. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF V. J. WEIGT, BARABOO, WIS.

Mr. Weigt. My name is Weigt. I am just a common, ordinary American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we all are.

Mr. Weigt. That is what I am—no more, no less.

The CHAIRMAN. That is good; that we are citizens of America.

Mr. Weigt. You know, Senator, they got me behind the 8-ball. They first was going to put me on just before lunch, and I could see everybody was thinking about eating. I says, "They won't listen to me." Now they got me and everybody is thinking about going home.

The CHAIRMAN. No, I do not think you were on that list. If you were, you would have been called.

Mr. Weigt. Number 34.

The CHAIRMAN. We are just down to 34 now.

Mr. Weigt. Good, that is it, then. I am the unofficial representative of about a dozen Americans and their names are on these cards. I do not have twelve copies of the statement, but I will read them. There are four of them.

First, Mr. Lynn Stoddard of Madison; L. J. McMahon, Milwaukee, announcer on radio station WMFM; Jenn Barry, hostess of the Green Bay Restaurant here in Milwaukee, and Mrs. Anna Hewitt, a mother and widow of Madison. They have signed the following statement:

Since atomic weapons are so terribly destructive, and since the United Nations can't keep the peace, I believe every effort should be made to strengthen the United Nations so the United Nations can take action to control all atomic materials and weapons of mass destruction, and so the United Nations can take lawful action to stop all acts of aggression that force nations into warfare.

Mr. Arnold Tygum of Madison, Wis., makes the following statement:

It is O. K. the way they are doing it now.

Mrs. Ann Kovara, a grandmother of Madison, Wis., says:

I strongly believe that the United Nations should have control of atomic materials because none would then use them in an aggressive manner.

Mr. William Stortz, proprietor of the Stortz Sheet Metal Shop of Baraboo, makes the following statement:

We ought to get after the ones who cause all the trouble. We should do something about them.

Now, I have these statements and I wondered since Senator Wiley has been so kind to answer all my letters, would you drop a letter to these folks who have had the courage to express themselves, a letter of thanks, please?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have their addresses?

Mr. Weigt. Yes, sir, they are right here.

The CHAIRMAN. Pass them on and we will see that letters go out to them.

Mr. WEIGT, An official representative of the Men's Fellowship Bible Class and also of the All For Christ Ladies Bible Class of the Advent Christian Church of Baraboo, Wis., I make the following statement:

PREVENTION OF ATOMIC WAR

We realize there would probably be no winner in an atomic world conflict. The production of military arms for such a conflict exhausts our resources, and straitens our economic system. The tension now existing between the great powers may end in strife, unless we all cooperate to establish international law and order that is so necessary for peace and justice between nations. We are praying earnestly that the new weapons of mass annihilation may never be used upon the peoples of any other nation nor upon us.

Therefore, we request our elected representatives to make every effort to revise the Charter of the United Nations so that the United Nations can codify and enforce international law in order to control all atomic materials and weapons to prevent their use for the destruction of cities and nations, and so the United Nations has the power to take legal action to stop all acts of aggression that force nations into warfare.

We suggest that the Charter of the United Nations be so revised that in case of a veto in the Security Council that a majority of the members of the Council may be able to appeal the case to the General Assembly, which shall have full power to act.

If these efforts to strengthen the United Nations should be blocked by the totalitarian forces and officials now bent on world conquest, then we request our elected officials to cooperate with other republics to create an international democratic organization that can effectively enforce world law to prevent war.

Respectfully submitted by the Men's Fellowship Bible Class of the Advent Christian Church of Baraboo, Wis., and All For Christ Ladies Bible Class of the same church.

Thank you. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Charles McClure of Appleton, Wis. Glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CHARLES McCLURE, APPLETON, WIS.

Mrs. McCLURE. Thank you, Senator Wiley. It is nice to have you home.

The CHAIRMAN. That was an awfully nice statement. That is the first time it has been said since I came. I have been waiting for it.

Mrs. McCLURE. I have been waiting to tell you. I really mean it. I am sorry that I could not tell our friendly Senator from our neighboring State that I was happy to see him here, too. He had to leave before I got here.

ASKING FOR MORE THAN WE WANT

I would like to say that the testimony I want to give has to do with the fact that I hope the Senate committee, those making the proposals to the United Nations in the charter revision, will operate from a position of maximum strength, recognizing that any proposals will probably have to be compromised.

Probably we know that other nations will have proposals that they will make, too, which makes for a bargaining situation. If we ask for more than we actually want, we may arrive pretty much where we would like to be.

With this gambit in mind, I make the following suggestions:

I am Mrs. Charles McClure of Appleton, Wis. I am here as an individual, as the mother of 4 children, and as the wife of a veteran who flew on the Doolittle raid over Tokyo, and served 5 years in the Air Force. I am active in civic affairs, and interested in politics. I served as the Eighth District chairwoman for "Citizens for Ike" in 1952.

I requested permission to testify before you today because of my conscience. I must know that when my two boys reach draft age that if they must go I have done all I could to urge the kind of world order that would have made their going unnecessary. If I did less than my best I would be unable to face them and the inevitable questions that they ask—and have the right to ask—when confronted with this national duty.

I am emphatically not a pacifist. I recognize that in an armed world, we must be armed—both as a protection and as a deterrent.

I feel that our country is faced with the "awe-ful"—in the literal sense—threat of the H-bomb. We have no monopoly in this, either, we are told. But I also believe that every problem offers an opportunity. I believe that American leadership today has such opportunities, both because today America has the responsibility of world leadership, and because world opinion is ready for a new, vital, imaginative, and practical answer to its fears.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR DRAMATIC DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

The Charter Review Conference can be our great opportunity to propose and advocate such a bold and practical answer. When it was drafted, the United Nations Charter was the world's best hope for peace, and it still is. It has accomplished much that is good in many areas. Its specialized agencies have been very effective. Several armed conflicts have been averted or arbitrated. But it could not prevent—only repel—the Korean aggression.

Today no major world power can risk its foreign policy entirely through the United Nations. We operate both within and without the United Nations, because the United Nations does not have the "spelled out" authority to make such usage practical. It cannot achieve fool-proof enforceable disarmament with its present structure. And because we have this double policy, we frustrate the United Nations, and we frustrate and confuse the public.

The President pointed out in his historic speech of April 16, 1953, that there can be no peace without international security. International security depends upon enforceable inspected disarmament.

This should not, and must not include any interference with the domestic affairs of any nation. No such interference is necessary.

A dramatic example of eleventh-hour action is the current meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Faced with the terrible potentialities of the chemical, biological, and radiological arm's race, the Disarmament Commission can only now put a finger

in the dike. This is the consequence of the present lack of "spelled out" responsible international law.

As an American, I am very conscious of threats to our way of life. In peace there is security—personal, national, and (potentially) international. And, with security, the maximum freedom for the individual and the Nation. In war, hot or cold, there must be demands both personal and economic upon every individual. There is no other safe way. The sacrifices must be made. But these sacrifices do tend slowly to alter our national life.

As a people, we Americans have the most to lose because we now have the highest standards of any peoples. Law protects rights and property and minorities (which, from the world view, we are).

The cost of war, preparation for war, and the aftermath of war is beyond our power to understand. The waste of human resources and material resources could easily provide a higher standard of living—not only for Americans. This waste today we must tolerate, but we must also do our utmost to find a way to rechannel our efforts to the proper and natural pursuits of peace. This, again, we can only do if we achieve international security under enforceable law.

When the United States enters a United Nations Charter Review Conference it should bring concrete proposals for United Nations Charter revisions which are directed toward achievement of a system of foolproof disarmament within the United Nations. These proposals must be carefully defined, since it would be both unrealistic and unsafe for any nation to consider any binding laws that might have a "broad interpretation" (for example, into the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations). Careful delineation of powers would be reassuring to all member nations.

I believe the basic key to world peace is a system of universal enforceable disarmament with all it implies of inspection and policing, of raising dependable revenue for the support of that police force, of the placing of responsibility for international aggression upon the individual aggressor, and of the existence of courts in which such aggressors would receive a just hearing, but in which they would be held accountable for their crimes, if found guilty.

Because the enforcement of law only has meaning when applied to individuals, there must be a world bill of rights for the protection of the individual peoples of each nation. If our Government's proposals for United Nations Charter revision are drawn from a detailed study of what would be required to make disarmament foolproof under the United Nations, we will make our greatest contribution to mankind and reawaken hope and confidence in us in the hearts of men around the world.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mrs. McClure.

Next is Lawrence Freeman. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE FREEMAN, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. FREEMAN. My name is Lawrence Freeman. I am appearing for the Marquette University Young Republicans Club. Six years ago Mrs. Roosevelt's Declaration on Human Rights became United Nations policy. She called the United Nations a prelude to world government.

DANGERS OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

Proponents of world government paint a mirage of peace, in which all men would be created equal and share equally. "All of this," they say, "for the tiny sacrifice of national sovereignty. Peace instead of sovereignty * * *," but they omit all proof that such a system could work, for they have disregarded the two human elements of self-preservation and personal interest.

Let us assume, however, that such a plan would work. Let's see how the United States would fare in a world government.

America has 6 percent of the total population of the world, and keeping this thought in mind, see how you think it would stack up in a world government election where 51 percent is needed to win. Quite right we would be in the minority with no substantial allies, for our allies of today were our enemies of yesterday.

Yes, we can have peace, but as Patrick Henry put it, "Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery."

Under world government, there would have to be equality of access and opportunity. America, with only 6 percent of the total population, puts out more than half of the world's goods and services. We have achieved this extraordinary output for a variety of reasons such as superior endowment of national natural resources, skills in technology, production, and the fact that we have half of the world's proved oil supplies and that we have 3 acres of land per capita compared to the world average of less than 1 acre. Under world government, there wouldn't be more land. It would just be reapportioned with the United States losing so much that it would be impossible to maintain our standard of living which requires at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres per capita.

Yes, we can have peace if we sacrifice prosperity. Along this same line, I should like to bring to mind the fact that in a world government it would be necessary to have free trade together with its inherent evils of cheap foreign labor and specialization, and lack of control over foreign cartels and monopolies.

It has been shown that fully 25 percent of all American workmen are in import-vulnerable industries and the services to which they give rise.

It has been further shown that there are over 50 industries which would be hurt through free trade.

Yes, we can have peace, but do we want it at the cost of the loss of our national sovereignty, loss of our jobs, industry, and strong agricultural economy, and, in general, the loss of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? Before we accept any such policy, I suggest that we reexamine the words of a statesman when he stated many, many years ago: "They that can sacrifice essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness will be Mr. Frank DiVilio. Glad to see you, sir.

STATEMENT OF FRANK DIVILIO, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. DiVilio, Mr. Wiley, gentlemen of the Senate subcommittee, I am Frank DiVilio representing myself and, as chairman, the 12th Ward Regular Republican Club and as past president of the Fourth Division Association (who are veterans of both World Wars of the Regular Fourth Infantry Division).

I come before you today as a veteran who has seen combat duty in the Armed Forces of the United States and the destruction of countries beyond our shores. I believe that the lives of our children and future generations of this country are greatly affected by the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations Charter as it stands today has been a farce and as weak as the League of Nations was before it. History has taught us that Russia has made a mockery of the United Nations Charter, using it as an instrument to better its own selfish wants. The cost of the United Nations has been a tremendous burden to the people of the United States and should be shared more equally by all nations.

DANGERS TO NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

Realizing the necessity of a United Nations organization because of world events and more so because of both the atom and hydrogen bombs, I and the members of the organizations that I represent strongly oppose any plan or proposal that would restrict or reduce in any way the sovereignty and independence of the United States. We feel the United Nations Charter now weakens and threatens the independence of the United States.

A review of the United Nations Charter is contemplated in article 109 (3), which calls for a conference on the agenda of the 10th annual session of the General Assembly and these problems will be considered:

1. The veto power.
2. The admission to membership of nations.
3. The establishment of world law.
4. The power to tax.
5. Establishment of military forces to enforce world law.
6. The adoption of a convention of human rights.

VETO TO BE KEPT EXCEPT ON MEMBERSHIP

1. The veto power: If exercised rightly, the veto is an aid to international progress. Although the veto has been greatly misused by Russia in the past we feel the elimination of the veto would relinquish the rights of the people of the United States which are guaranteed by our Constitution. It would give the United Nations organization the authority above the Constitution of the United States. We are in favor of eliminating the veto as to the admission of nations into the membership of the United Nations only. An amendment restricting the abuse of the veto by nations would also be advisable. We maintain that the veto power is not an evil but that it is a most valuable sovereign right and the basis upon which our independence and security rest.

2. Membership in the United Nations: We favor the retention of this article with the abolition of the veto power.

OTHER PROBLEM AREAS

3. World law: We are entirely opposed to this article as it places a citizen of the United States under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and would deprive him of the "due processes of law" guaranteed under our Bill of Rights.

4. The power to tax: The people of the United States are heavily burdened by tax and we feel that any contribution to the United Nations should be voluntary contributions.

5. World military force: We oppose this article on the grounds that this military force might well be used against the people of the United States and compel us to complete subjugation.

6. Convention of human rights: This proposed article would supersede the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, it does not contain a protection against the taking of private property without "due process of law." And last of all, it has been said that substantial portions of the conventions of human rights has been taken verbatim from the Soviet constitution.

It appears that there are those, some who have the best of intentions, who would involve the United States in a world government or other type of supergovernment. They are the same people who oppose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect our internal law against encroachment or Executive agreement. We the members of the 12th Ward Regular Republican Club and the Fourth Division Association support such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The veterans of the Fourth Division Association and the members of the 12th Ward Regular Republican Club, who have a great deal in common, consistent with their recognized patriotic purposes and their opposition to any form of world or supergovernment, urges the rejection by our Government of the various proposals outlined in this statement and any other proposal which would alter the United Nations Charter so as to abolish or restrict the sovereignty, independence, and security of the United States.

Our leaders, and we as individuals, should always be aware of the dangers which threaten the Government of the United States. We should be vigilant to guard against the entrapment of our country by false promises and elusive cure-alls, lest constitutional government shall become a mere memory in America to be read in history books.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

Maj. Alfred A. Treutel, of the National Sojourners, Inc., and the Military Order of World Wars.

Carry on, sir.

STATEMENT OF ALFRED A. TREUTEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. TREUTEL. Senator, and to your committee as well, I want to express the appreciation of both organizations which I represent here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We love appreciation, just like everybody else.

Mr. TREUTEL. You do? That is just fine.

I, Alfred A. Treutel, major, retired, regional representative for Wisconsin of the National Sojourners, Inc., and by special appointment, representative for this occasion, of the Military Order of World Wars, present the following statement on behalf of these organizations.

Both organizations are of national note; their patriotic purposes, the zeal of their members in times of their country's danger, as well as their zeal in opposing any influence whatever which would tend to weaken our national security, is well known. Both organizations are composed of many thousands of active and Reserve officers of our Armed Forces. Many have served in two wars. As such they have first-hand experience which well qualify them to be heard on such vital matters as the proposed changes of the United Nations Charter in 1955.

The United Nations was established to bring about a better understanding between nations. We are mindful of the need of nations living at peace and proper standards of world conduct, but we oppose attempts to grant additional power to the United Nations Organization, however sincere the purpose might be, at the expense of weakening the security of the United States.

OPPOSITION TO CHANGES

Changes in powers of the United Nations which would subtly bring it into the position of having greater power than our Congress to regulate our homes should be vetoed. Proponents to changes in the United Nations Charter would have it that world law be enforceable directly upon the individuals without Congress having any say in the matter, including the taxing of the individual. Such ideas, including the prohibiting of any armaments excepting internal police force, have been tried to be put over by world-government proponents in 23 states. When the subtle scheme was exposed 21 of the 23 states which passed resolutions for national constitutional changes quickly rescinded them. These same influences are now about to try to accomplish the end, which was frustrated in the constitutional amendment failure, by trying to bring about the United Nations Charter changes.

We oppose these changes:

We oppose the elimination of the veto power. The veto safeguards any country's position—guarantees sovereignty. Rather effect limits of the use of veto power, thereby restrict its abuse.

We oppose membership in the United Nations of nations regardless of political principles under which they govern. Soviet nations have vetoed the admission of 14 nations which might otherwise have been admitted, whereas the United States and other nations have opposed the admission of the mainland government of China.

We oppose any world law enforceable on individuals which would establish international courts with criminal jurisdiction, enactment of criminal law which would bring new offenses and bring to trial alleged offenders under a system different than our own and deprive our citizens of the due processes under our Bill of Rights.

We oppose the power to tax us. We are now contributing voluntarily to the United Nations the major portion of the expenses which the honorable Senator has mentioned this afternoon particularly. Any

tax directed upon us by the United Nations would not be acceptable to any United States citizen.

We oppose a world military force which would place us in a position of subjugation, for with it would come a requirement that we could only maintain an internal police force. A stuck world court could quickly reduce us to a nonentity.

We oppose the convention on human rights because it does not give protection against seizure of private property without "due process of law" guaranteed by our 5th and 14th amendments. It is repugnant because where it appears to guarantee rights comparable to our own, vague language suggests that these rights might be suspended by government fiat. It is said that substantial portions have been taken verbatim from the Soviet constitution.

Plans for changes in the United Nations Charter, as indicated above, are opposed by all our leading military and veteran organization and those which stem from the very cradle of our liberty, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Sons of the American Revolution, as well as the majority of our citizenry.

Our leaders should guard well our liberty; don't sell out our birth-right.

And I believe that has been assured to us by the members of the subcommittee who has spoken several times here today to assure us that such is not the case. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We have now covered the list of those who made requests to speak.

There was submitted to me a few moments ago a request from someone implying that my associates and myself have not been very fair, and wanting to be heard for 5 minutes.

I get from what this petition says, and I shall not place it in the record, that the comments of my associates, Senators Mansfield and Gillette, and I suppose myself, in response to what was said by witnesses concerning the so-called controversy over the Bricker Amendment, were political speeches.

Now, we have had a wonderful time here. Wisconsin citizens are credited all over for being fair. If those who signed the petition have one individual who wants 5 minutes to take the floor and talk, I shall be happy to accord him that opportunity. He will at least have to say that the senior Senator from Wisconsin wants to grant everyone a chance to be heard.

Let me suggest that no personalities be indulged in, and let me suggest that we are here to discuss how better to improve the United Nations or to get rid of the same.

Now, if that speaker will come forward he can have the 5 minutes requested.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

FURTHER STATEMENTS OF WILLIAM J. MORGAN AND ALFRED A. TREUTEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. MORGAN. Senator Wiley, I thought it was unfortunate that one of your associates asked the question, "Do you not trust the Senators of the United States on the matter of ratification of treaties?"

May I ask you, Senator, if it is not a fact that treaties have been ratified with less than 20 Senators present?

TREATY-RATIFYING PROCEDURE

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I suppose I should, General Morgan, open up the subject. Let me suggest to you that before any treaty, or so-called treaty, is submitted to the Senate of the United States, that first it has the complete agreement of the State Department on the subject. Then that treaty goes to the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am chairman, and the Foreign Relations Committee sits on that treaty and holds public hearings. The treaty goes on the record, and it can be objected to by any Senator, and gone over, but because Senators are busy in their committees, and because they are busy with a thousand and one activities, the leaders of the majority and minority parties will sit there, and they know whether there is any objection to any treaty.

Now, secondly, we have agreed that we will, by simple resolution, change the rules of the Senate, so that there must be first a quorum call, and that there must be then a majority of Senators present.

So that the answer to your question is Yes, there have been instances, and the same with important legislation, where the Senators are not present because their committees have approved the matter unanimously, and the Senators know what it is all about, so they are engaged in their other activities.

Mr. TRUETEL. You made the point that I wished brought out, Senator. Thank you very much, sir.

It is a fact that on one occasion, at least, where two covenants of the United Nations and one treaty were ratified there were only two Senators present.

Now, then, it is also true that the Senators must take the report of the Foreign Relations Committee, and take it in good faith, and it is not a fact, or, rather, is it not a fact, that that being true, relying upon the recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee, some Senators vote for treaties without having read the treaty?

The CHAIRMAN. There isn't any question about that, that some will vote for it without reading it. However, they need not take the report.

Remember this, legislation is a matter where each side, the majority and the minority, have what you might call inspection committees that pass upon every piece of legislation that comes on the calendar, and they go through that legislation, and if it is not satisfactory it goes over.

If any Senator objects, it goes over, and, consequently, it is necessary, as a matter of mechanical process, to get it done that way. What is going to happen? You go ahead and amend the rules, which we will, because of public misunderstanding. There has been in the whole history of the United States only one treaty that has been set aside. That treaty was a treaty with France back in 1800, when France did not live up to its obligations, and we set aside the treaty by a joint resolution of the House and the Senate. That is all there was to that. That is the only treaty that has been questioned, and any treaty can be set aside the same way.

Mr. TRUETEL. That would mean you are repudiating the treaty. Wasn't it Jay who said, "Violation of treaties and the breach of treaties is the greatest cause of war"?

And I cite you another case, the Cherokee Indians, where the treaty was with an Indian tribe, and was set aside in the lower court, but

the United States Supreme Court has never yet set aside a treaty, and it is true that the Bricker amendment would not have in the slightest degree hampered the ability of the President and the Senate to make treaties concerning our international affairs.

And that was what the framers of the Constitution intended—that treaties should be used as contracts in international affairs.

MODIFYING THE CONSTITUTION

One hundred and sixty-six years ago they were anxious to see that Britain kept a treaty that it had negotiated with Jay. They didn't want to give any excuse to repudiate it, so they put in a clause in the Constitution making treaties as sacrosanct as the Constitution itself.

Now, after the lapse of 166 years, the reason that brought that into the Constitution no longer exists. Would you have any objection to striking from the supremacy clause "and treaties made or to be made," leaving the treaty power separate from the supremacy clause?

The CHAIRMAN. I have argued the matter. As I said, we did not come here for that purpose. I want to say to you again that Mr. Bricker, when he was on the floor, said he never did have any faith in the "which" clause, in substance. When Mr. Bricker said it was not in his original resolution, and agreed to take it out, he himself then admitted that the very thing which is so dangerous, and which would have delimited the power of the Executive in the atomic age, was not so dangerous. That is all there is to that.

Mr. TREUTEL. We don't want to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Your 5 minutes is up, and I am not going to exhaust myself any more. [Applause.]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been very patient, and I will admit that possibly after a day like this, that one could be a little short, but I did not mean to be so with Bill. I have known him as a great lawyer and a good friend.

I just want to call to your attention a few things. We are all engaged in one great enterprise, and that is to try to keep America adequate in the atom age, the H-bomb age, so that it can meet any challenge.

While we have differences, it is good that we do, as was said by one of the Senators.

WEAKNESSES OF HUMANS, NOT THE U. N.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the trouble with the United Nations is not the United Nations, but the trouble is poor benighted humanity.

As was said, there are 2,300 million human beings in this world, and less than 300 million of us really want the democratic way of life, so in the political field we are in a minority.

But there has been a hunger for freedom since man first came out of the cave to find a way when men could reason out their differences, and they have tried various things, and the United Nations is just another attempt.

U. N. ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

If the people of the world are not ready for the United Nations, the United Nations will not do the job. But it has done considerable. First, it has stopped aggression at the 30th parallel in Korea.

Secondly, it has prevented a possible outbreak of war in Iran.

Third, it stopped difficulties between Greece, Albania, and Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

Fourth, it helped bring about a cease-fire, although they still are fighting off and on, between Palestine and the Arabs.

Fifth, it helped to resolve serious differences between the Netherlands and Indonesia.

Sixth, it helped to bring an end to the Berlin blockade, and extensions between the East and the West.

Seventh, it helped to bring about the cease-fire in Kashmir, in the dispute between India and Pakistan.

Now, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter, the Atlantic Pact came into being. The Rio Pact, and other regional agreements to mutual defense against aggression have been concluded, and what is more, the United Nations undoubtedly in these pacts has made it so that the commies have not taken over any more territory or groups.

Someone said today that the United Nations had had something to do with the taking over of China by the Kremlin. No; it didn't have anything to do with that. The Kremlin just marched in and took over.

The United Nations has also tendered technical assistance in many areas. Just last week I was up to the U. N. and spoke to 32 youngsters from 32 foreign nations—red, black, white, and yellow—and they sat on a platform with me. Five thousand youngsters of New York City, and their parents, were seated out there. These youngsters told what it meant to come to America and to see our way of life. They are going back home and tell what they saw.

Now, that is part of a United Nations endeavor. It is not perfect. People talk today about God. God looked upon what He made and it was good, but man has bailed the thing up.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Now, it is for you and me to be competent and adequate so that we can straighten it out. We don't know whether the United Nations will do the job, but we do know this, we are going to try to see that there is some instrumentality whereby people can meet at the crossroads of the world and discuss their troubles, and not simply try to handle them with swords.

I was privileged to represent this Government at two sessions, a general session and a special session, and I called it the crossroads of the world. I wish that some of you could go up there and have that experience.

It will not bring about the millennium, but it expressed the hope, and I think vision of poor, tired humanity reaching out.

We come here not to talk as I am talking now, no, we come here to learn. You have been very helpful, and with my associates here I want to say that the testimony is now closed.

I want to express my gratitude for the witnesses for bearing with us throughout this long meeting.

We have heard excellent testimony today, and I am so happy that today we have discussed ideas and not personalities. We have tried to see our way through the mist that poor, tired humanity has created, not God, and I am sure my colleagues will take back to

Washington with them a great deal of constructive food for thought.

I want to thank the members of this audience for sitting with us today, and to express particular appreciation for the witnesses who could not be heard, either at all, or in as full length as we might all have hoped.

And I also thank the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

I hope that this hearing will not be the closing acts, but simply the first act in an extended review here in Milwaukee and Wisconsin on the problems of international organization and security.

A printed transcript of the Milwaukee hearing today will be available later in the spring. It will be forwarded on request to all interested individuals.

Now, my friends, the curtain will be pulled down. We have come here; we are grateful; we go away thankful for all your courtesies.

Thank you.

(Whereupon at 5:20 p. m., the subcommittee stood in recess subject to the call of the chairman.)

(The following additional statements were received during and subsequent to the hearing:)

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

Madison, Wis., April 10, 1953.

What about the United Nations? Has it been a success? A failure? The people of our churches have a right to know. They were among those who helped to establish it. They took the initiative in demanding that an international organization be created to maintain the peace. When the charter was signed in San Francisco in 1945 there was great rejoicing.

It is 1954. Nine years have gone by. We are not blind to the fact that the United Nations has had limitations and weaknesses. It would be a distinct disservice to the U. N. to catalogue its achievements and then refuse to face its failures, its limitations, and its weaknesses.

It has failed to stop the cold war. That war continues. The member states promised at San Francisco they would "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." This promise has not been kept.

It is specified in the charter that the U. N. is to be the center for harmonizing the actions of nations. Thus far the U. N. has not been able to bring harmony between the different blocs of nations.

Everyone knows the promise of the members of the U. N. to establish a system for the regulations of armaments. The armament race is on with acceleration. As for collective security, no agreement has been reached on the principles which would govern the organization and use of the proposed contingents of armed forces. There are still violent differences of opinion on this subject. The Big Five and the veto have fallen far short of their objective.

The U. N. is not a supergovernment invested with power to impose its will on sovereign states. The U. N. is not a self-starting political mechanism. It is not a piece of machinery that operates independently of the hands by which it is constructed. The weakness lies not so much with the U. N. as with the tensions which disturb the relations among nations and people.

May I merely enumerate some of the achievements of the U. N.

In the area of its political activities, the U. N. opposed hostilities in certain parts of the world. For example, in Palestine and in Kashmir the U. N. was instrumental in silencing the guns of war.

The U. N. accepted the challenge posed by aggression of Communist forces against the Republic of Korea.

In the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms the U. N. has advanced on many fronts. For the first time in history there has been given to the peoples of the world a universal declaration of human rights.

For the first time in history, there has been negotiated an International Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

A convention on Political Rights of Women has been approved and submitted to the member states of the U. N. for ratification. The General Assembly has exerted its moral influence on behalf of minority peoples in South Africa, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary.

In the area of its economic activities the U. N. has initiated and carried forward a program of technical assistance that offers great promise for the future. If enduring peace with justice is to be achieved there must be gradual improvement of the living standards of peoples around the world.

Through the U. N. efforts are being made to facilitate world trade to encourage land reform and to lift economic "iron curtains" all over the world.

Through its specialized agencies the U. N. is rendering a service of genuine benefits to mankind.

The U. N. does provide an alternative to war. It makes available at all times a conference table to which can be brought those explosive issues which might, but for the U. N., erupt into global war.

Over and beyond its more specific achievements it has brought into focus the essential oneness of mankind and provided an opportunity for the fuller expression of universal brotherhood.

The U. N. has had its achievements—many of them. These successes outweigh by far the failures and weaknesses—thus, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, we believe that the U. N. can be built into the effective agency of world understanding and peace which mankind so desperately needs.

As to the proposal for revision of the charter, there is a growing public concern. In general the National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order support the call for a review conference in 1953.

Should the conference be held, there are revisions which merit study and deliberation. Such problems require study by experts in governments and non-governmental agencies including churches. These items would include the following:

(a) The functions and powers of the five permanent member nations as now provided for the charter.

(b) Larger scope and wider powers in the work of the General Assembly.

(c) Should the nations agree upon a world organization, consideration of two bodies, one corresponding to our Senate and a general assembly with weighted membership basis.

(d) Revision of membership requirement.

(e) Provision for the delegation of authority to such bodies as a disarmament authority.

(f) Improved arrangements whereby the U. N. General Assembly and U. N. councils can play a larger part in guiding and nurturing under-developed peoples and nations of higher standards of living.

Great caution is needed lest an untimely review conference for charter revision, should provide an opportunity for the enemies of the U. N. to weaken the charter while changing. We should make sure also that the time is right to make such changes.

The National Council of Churches which has inherited the belief in the necessity for a world organization expressed through the Federal Council at the time of the San Francisco Conference in 1945, calls all American Christians to acquaint themselves with the U. N. and to give it their unwavering support.

The board of directors of the Wisconsin Council of Churches, at its quarterly meeting in Madison on April 6, 1954, went on record in favor of such a statement as this regarding the U. N. and for strengthening the U. N. in all ways possible.

On behalf of the board of directors:

DR. W. ROSS CONNER,

State Council Delegate to the Churches and World Order Conference in Cleveland in October 1953. Methodist District Superintendent.

Rev. ROY E. BOSSEMAN,

Richland Center, Chairman of the Commission on Citizenship and Legislation.

Rev. ERLING PETERSON,

Minister of Evangelical United Brethren Church of Kenosha; former staff member of the State Council; and delegated spokesman for the Council on April 19, 1954.

DR. ELLIS H. DANA,

Executive Vice President.

Sources: National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order papers, October 27-30, 1953; World Order Day Message, October 25, 1953; The Church and the United Nations—Walter W. Van Kirk; American Association for the United Nations, Inc., materials; Crusade for World Order—the Methodist Peace Courier pamphlet, October 1953; Economist Studies pamphlet, No. 4, 1954.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Madison, Wis., April 10, 1954.

To: The Honorable Alexander H. Wiley, Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Subject: U. N. Charter revision

The League of Women Voters of Madison herewith confirms its support of the United Nations. In accordance with the principle of international cooperation, which we have long affirmed, we favor the enactment of suitable measures to strengthen this organization.

In our efforts to spread understanding of the United Nations in our community, we have observed a generally favorable response among individuals, civic and church groups and others, to the purposes of the U. N. in its attempt to achieve the goal of a peaceful world.

Mrs. WILLIAM HURST,
President, League of Women Voters of Madison.

The Madison monthly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) wishes to take this opportunity to express its faith in the United Nations as an instrument of bringing world peace by various constructive means. Its splendid accomplishments in health, aid to children, improvement of agricultural and economic conditions in underdeveloped countries are only a few of its many good works which increase the stature and worth of all human beings.

It is our belief that the United Nations is of invaluable aid in peacemaking, and we suggest that this function could be improved by the following means: (1) Admit all applicant nations who are willing to accept the responsibility of membership; (2) insure an unbiased mediation commission that will give careful objective consideration to views held by both sides in conflicts; (3) strengthen the mediation and conciliation commission of the United Nations by referring disputes to it more frequently; (4) aid to underdeveloped countries and to those nations recuperating from the throes of war should be channeled through the United Nations in order to agree to mutually helpful relief and sharing of skills. This method would disassociate the giving of aid in various forms from imperialism which often accompanies assistance given by certain countries or blocs.

We recommend the resolution proposed last year by the Friends Committee on National Legislation as follows: "The study of the United Nations should include changes needed in the charter and in the Constitution of the United States to transform the United Nations into a limited world federation with dependable revenue, capable of achieving and carrying out world disarmament."

Approved by Madison monthly meeting of Friends, April 1, 1954, as prepared by Agnes C. Hole, 2201 Center Avenue, Madison 4, Wis.

AGNES C. HOLE

CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
MAYOR'S COMMITTEE ON COST OF LIVING,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 9, 1954.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee,
United Nations Charter Revision.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Our committee would like to request that some consideration be given to consumer matters by the United Nations.

It is our feeling that there should be provisions made for setting up a consumer's council somewhere in the United Nations, to represent consumer's interest throughout the world.

We would appreciate it very much if this matter were taken up at this time and that you notify us if we can be of any help to you.

Very truly yours,

A. L. TILTON, *Chairman.*

To: The Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter.

From: Willette C. Pierce, 2837 North Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

Date: April 10, 1954.

May I first express my appreciation to the committee for giving us, the people, this opportunity to express our opinions regarding the charter of the United Nations, and to offer our suggestions for revisions.

Since I am not as well versed as I would wish regarding the actual working of this charter, my views and suggestions are presented without reference to specific sections in the document.

I believe that the United States should support the proposal contained in the charter, that a general conference be called to review the charter of the United Nations.

I believe that we should eliminate the veto on matters pertaining to pacific settlement of disputes.

I believe that the veto should be eliminated when considering admission of member nations.

I believe in channeling economic aid through the United Nations and enhancing the provisions for technical assistance.

I believe we should support incorporation of a bill of human rights.

I believe in the United Nations as an instrument by which nations of this world may develop an understanding of one another, and conceivably work out ways and means of living together as a family of peaceful nations.

A STATEMENT PREPARED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The Wisconsin division of the American Association of University Women believes in the United Nations. It agrees with Secretary Dulles that the charter "represents man's most determined and promising effort to save humanity from the scourge of war." It believes that the United Nations is a going concern and that the range and scope of its activities are enormous—easing the burden here, lending a hand there and bringing hope of peace, security and a better life to peoples in all corners of the globe. It believes that the United Nations is the cornerstone of our country's foreign policy since our national interests are best promoted through cooperative not dictated effort. It pledges its support as a statewide organization of all measures directed toward increasing the effectiveness of United States participation in it and its affiliated agencies.

However, in spite of an impressive 8-year record of achievement, the A. A. U. W. does not feel that the United Nations has lived up to expectations. It believes that these first years have revealed glaring weaknesses that have limited its effectiveness in the maintenance of peace and security.

Wisely the charter provides for its own amendment; it provides also for the calling of an international conference to review that charter in the light of the experiences and changing conditions of the first ten years.

We believe that the greatest weaknesses have developed in the working of the Security Council. This agency was given primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. To carry out this responsibility it was given a dual role—that of enforcement and of peaceful settlement of international disputes. Its effectiveness in both has been limited and the volume of work performed by it is steadily decreasing—as evidenced by the decline in the number of meetings from a peak of 180 in 1947-48 to 26 in 1952-53.

Recognizing that this situation is more the result of East-West conflict in the world than in any real defect of the charter, the Wisconsin division of the A. A. U. W. nevertheless urges the United States Senate to make a careful study of the role of the Security Council and the rules under which it operates.

1. The 80th Congress of the Senate passed a resolution (S. R. 230)—the so-called Vandenberg Resolution—recommending for one thing, the limitation of the use of the veto in questions involving pacific settlement of disputes. Further consideration of this resolution is suggested.

2. Further study of the concept of procedural matters is also urged with a view to broadening its interpretations thus minimizing the effect of the veto.

Whether amendments to the charter are possible at this time—or even wise—the Wisconsin division of the A. A. U. W. believes that a full-scale review of the problem is imperative. The question of ways and means it leaves to the experts with but one test to be applied to my proposal:

Will it strengthen the United Nations as an effective agency for the maintenance of peace and security?

Any proposal that passes this test will have the support of our organization

BERNICE M. SCOTT,

State Chairman, International Relations

Wisconsin Division, American Association of University Women.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 10, 1954.

To the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate:

As a plain, individual citizen of Wisconsin, I want to express my belief that the United Nations is the best hope we have in this fear-ridden world of securing peaceful settlement of quarrels between nations and of increasing the better living, justice, and human rights on which peace largely depends.

I believe we should work to develop more economic cooperation. Aid to less wealthy countries and greater freedom of trade, arranged as much as possible through the United Nations, seems clearly to be in our interest. Economic and social welfare in all nations now inevitably affects the welfare of all other nations, and United Nations activities in these fields can cement bonds and create invaluable good feeling. Everywhere we must work to enlarge the field of mutual interests, the things that affect individual lives, and are therefore matters of common concern wherever we may live on the globe.

Certain steps, with or without charter revision, can be taken. Additional work in the economic field is chiefly a matter of larger appropriations for technical assistance and for the U. N. specialized agencies. I would urge such increased appropriations. For the settlement of disputes patient negotiation between governments is essential, while the United Nations can focus attention on the problems, discover facts, and help the parties get together, without necessarily imposing a solution.

In a world that possesses the hydrogen bomb, I am definitely in favor of increasing the power of the United Nations, in eventually turning it into a limited world government. We must continue to seek agreements in the vital field of armament control and reduction. But until the East-West tension is somewhat relaxed, it seems futile to believe that changes in the charter will make much difference. We might well give up the veto on membership questions. And we should continue to emphasize the valuable role of the Assembly. But chiefly we must seize each opportunity to make the present machinery work, through patient, persistent, and generous effort.

ROSAMOND ELIOT RICE

WORLD COURT CHARTER FOR A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Copyrighted 1945 by Herbert Max Jierscheck, Milwaukee, Wis., U. S. A.

(Translations Permitted Upon Request)

To the people of all nations: This charter sums up what must be agreed upon by the people of all nations to enforce perpetual world peace. It is up to you, the common people everywhere, to vote on the dispensable principles to outlaw war forever. You will take part in the greatest worldwide demonstration to shape world unity as ever presented in mankind's history. This charter gives you the power to decide the future destiny of your nation, whether you want it to enact into constitutional law the necessary steps to insure a just and lasting peace. Truly, this is democracy in action. When you sign your name to this charter, you are actually voting to prevent millions of innocent babies now living from death in future warfare. Here are the World Court principles or keys which will unlock any barriers to world peace:

Master key: We, the people _____, hereafter called _____ (Print in name of your nation) our nation, hereby agree to entitle every nation, large or small, to be represented

as a member of the World Court, which works for world unity, justice, and mutual protection against any aggressor nation that plans for war.

(Note: Change name of "United Nations" to "World Court" at Lake Success, N. Y.)

AS A CITIZEN OF MY COUNTRY, I HEREBY PETITION THAT

Key

Page

- I. Our nation agrees never to engage in aggressive warfare unless our territory is attacked.
- II. Our nation agrees never to manufacture offensive weapons of war, as bombers, jet robot planes, submarines, and the like.
- III. Our nation agrees to permit each nation to maintain limited but adequate weapons for defense purposes only, so as to assure constant preparedness in the interests of self-defense.
- IV. Our nation agrees to permit each nation to maintain limited but adequate armed forces, calling for volunteers only to serve 4 years in versatile defense training on a reinforcement basis at excellent pay.
- V. Our nation agrees to support the international secret police organization, made up of special agents and military intelligence from all nations, who report to the World Court any suspicious violations of the peace principles.
- VI. Our nation agrees to support the World Court decisions to police any nation found guilty of mass hatred and planned warfare toward other nations, by sending our quota of armed forces to curb such uprisings by force if necessary.
- VII. Our nation agrees to encourage world trade abundantly through low tariff rates uniform for each nation alike, which is designed to avoid competitive unfairness between nations and to give all peoples of the earth better comforts of living.
- VIII. Our nation agrees to join the World Bank for better currency stabilization between all nations, so that nations may export and import goods generously, according to the nation's credit status in terms of just repayment in trade.
(For example, Russia exports some of its vast timber resources to America in exchange for lease land supplies, which enables Americans to own their homes at a much lower cost.)
- IX. Our nation agrees to permit free airplane traffic for all nations, and each nation reports to the World Court how it will supervise air travel equitably, so that all nations are united to understand one another better.
- X. Our nation agrees to become a World Court member, having the power to vote on disputes between nations. If any nation disobeys any World Court ruling, such nation will be prohibited to trade with other nations until amends are made.
- XI. Our nation agrees to support financially the teaching of the universal language English, given freely to all peoples, of all nations who want to understand that such mutual willingness to learn promotes world progress in the interest of peace.
"I beseech you . . . that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind."—1 Corinthians 12:10.
- XII. Our nation agrees that one of the greatest forces for world harmony is to create a universal religion uniting every existing religion into one world church, which prevents sectarian strife as well as millions of people to stay away from church.
(The world church must be a simple religion as Christ taught it, to love one another, to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and the belief in one God and His natural laws for all mankind to obey, which automatically strips churchy ritualisms and superstitions from their mythical, elusive cloaks.)

Now act: As a citizen of my country, I hereby record my name as a witness for world justice, and petition those in authority to enact into constitutional law the World Court principles for an enforced peace machinery by all nations united to prevent future war forever:

Your name: _____ Your address: _____

(Comment: This charter, in its simple form, can replace all the wordings in volumes of present U. N. rules and procedures.)

"Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace."—Romans 14:9.

"Your most powerful weapon for world peace is your registered opinion."—H. M. J.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."—Matthew 5:9.

Mail this form to the highest authority of your country at once. Dedicated to the success of the San Francisco World Security Conference.

WAUKESHA, Wis., April 10, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Milwaukee Auditorium, Milwaukee:

Because Western Europe does not want to be the battleground of a conflict between the United States and Russia, we cannot count on any help from NATO in the event of war. We should adopt a foreign policy of self-reliance and independent action. United Nations is not effective instrument of peace or security. Do not drop the veto. We may want to use it sometime.

Korea proves the futility of police action against a major power. We must not get involved in any more like it.

With the hydrogen bomb and the planes to use it in our possession, no foreign power would dare to attack us. America's best defense against communism is to make America strong and prosperous. You should devote your energy and skill toward making democracy succeed on the homefront and let the rest of the world take care of itself.

JOHN C. LOVE.

MERRILL, Wis., April 10, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Care of Milwaukee Auditorium, Milwaukee:

Suggest you padlock United Nations building and send these parasites off the Federal payroll. Regards.

HAROLD MORGAN.

DELAWARE, Wis., April 10, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Review Hearing of the U. N. Charter Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Congratulations on simplicity, impartiality, clarity of your discussions and reply in this vital attempt.

RHODA HAMILTON.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., April 10, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Plankinton Hall, Milwaukee Auditorium:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Milwaukee Board of Realtors would like to protest the U. N. document which refuses to include right to own property among basic rights, because the U. N. commission which is preparing a covenant on human rights has twice rejected the insistence of American delegates that the right to own property be recognized as a human right. We ask that the consideration of the covenant be dropped. We further protest consideration of the covenant and to seek a dismissal of the commission that has proposed it; in one word the consistent disregard of the basic importance of the human right to own property as guaranteed in the bill of rights of our Constitution. We further demand that the right to own property be proposed and adopted as a separate article at the U. N. Charter Revision Conference in 1955. Your consideration in this request is greatly appreciated.

THE MILWAUKEE BOARD OF REALTORS,
J. W. BUELLEBACH, President,
LOREN TREFENTHALE, Vice President,
CHARLES A. HARRIS, Secretary-Treasurer,
DONALD R. GAU, Executive Vice President.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., March 31, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are interested in the special Senate subcommittee meeting to be held in Milwaukee on April 10, for the purpose of obtaining local opinion on changes which might be proposed in the United Nations Charter in 1955.

Changes should be carefully considered and the basic purpose of the United Nations Organization preserved. Four years ago we deemed the matter of sufficient importance to distribute, in this vicinity, 3,000 copies of an address by Mr. Foster Bailey, 11 West 42d Street, New York City, which was delivered before the Tunbridge Wells branch of the United Nations Association in Great Britain on March 15, 1950. This message is as appropriate now as at the time it was written, and in order to clarify the thinking of the group, would it be possible to have this message read? It expresses the ideas of our group, and we are sure those of many of our fellow citizens, more adequately than we might be able to do if we appeared before the committee.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EUGENE DE RATH,
(For a Milwaukee Group of Men and Women of Good Will.)

CAN THE UNITED NATIONS SUCCEED?

The pressures of the postwar period precipitating a succession of larger and smaller crises and the varying tempo of the cold war bring to the public a stream of headline news items which becomes bewildering. The average citizen has not the time to keep sufficiently well informed and it is little wonder that the deeper essentials become obscured in his thinking.

The world accepted the organization of the United Nations as a mechanism through which postwar adjustments would be made, world stability achieved and the danger of a possible third world war avoided. So much has happened so fast which is understood by so few that there has emerged an increasing sense of futility and a tendency to think that the United Nations after all is not going to achieve what was expected of it.

We have all been forced to recognize that the modern world is one world, but our thinking along these lines is still inadequate and unskilled. Humanity today is like the sick patient, who has been desperately ill but who has survived two major operations and is just beginning to show signs of getting over the shock. Those who have had experience and can appreciate the psychological, emotional, and physical exhaustion of the entire world, are really amazed at the recovery achieved on the physical plane. That Great Britain and the European countries have done so well since the close of World War II, should be highlighted for the strengthening encouragement it justifies.

On the other hand, there is bitter disappointment that two world wars should not have sufficiently changed our thinking so that the statesmen of the nations and the intelligent people of all lands would have been willing to make short-range sacrifices for long-range stability and the establishing of world peace.

We ask ourselves, therefore, can the United Nations succeed? The answer is "yes" if we make it succeed. The answer is very possibly "no" if we content ourselves with hastily following the daily news and talking about it but really leave world affairs and the United Nations organization itself to the national delegates, most of whose names are actually unknown to millions, and who have been appointed often under pressure, under rules and regulations about which the public knows little and cares less.

There are wise and public-spirited statesmen delegated by their governments in attendance at the sessions of the United Nations. Many of these men are skilled diplomats and are far more deeply concerned with world conditions and far more eager to get constructive results than are the people whom they officially represent. Their position is one of extreme difficulty. They are there representing nations, which means that they are subjected to the political necessities arising out of national politics. They are forced to take positions on what is described as "political necessity," which means simply the determination of a particular group that happens to be in power to do what will perpetuate itself in power. The governments they represent are under terrific pressure from very powerful business interests fighting for world markets and for protection for their home markets, from ideological groups within their own borders

and sometimes from across their frontiers. They do things or refrain from doing things because of the powerful pressure of highly organised religious bodies. They must enter always to the practical need to go along with popular causes. The wonder is that, skilled as these delegates may be, they can ever come to any constructive solutions and agreements on anything at all that really matters. If the situation is properly understood, the record to date of the United Nations is something to be proud of. We perhaps have expected too much of it.

Public statesmen today and the national delegates at the United Nations are smothered by all these pressures. They are frustrated in their efforts. They are compelled to push for particular short-range benefits for their nation in spite of their knowledge that a wiser and more humanitarian attitude and programme is being sacrificed. A delegate who does not fight for the selfish interests of his nation is not popular at home and so self-seeking competitive nationalism is again increasingly dominating the whole field. This was the main factor which ruined the League of Nations at Geneva after World War I.

Our delegates and statesmen must have the active support of the public spirited men and women of good will in every nation if they are to succeed. The way out of our appalling confusion and dangerous world situation will never be found and the necessary agreements achieved and the needed programmes implemented without this public support.

It is this necessity for public support which is the strongest evidence that what we call the democratic way of life is essential to civilisation itself, for it is evident that the will of the people ultimately controls. Even the dictators spend vast sums of money and create highly efficient organisations propagandising their own people. Hitler could not have dominated the German nation if he had not sold the German people his programme, and the men in the Kremlin could not maintain their stranglehold over the people of Russia, even with their internal spy system and police power, if the people themselves were not controlled in their thinking.

In the democracies, governments live only so long as the people want them to live. It is true also that the United Nations will live only so long as the people of the world have faith in it and want it to live. When the people of the world lose faith in it beyond a certain point and when the public spirited citizens of the world abandon it to unknown delegates whose actions seldom arouse any comment except sharp criticisms, failure is foredoomed.

The future of our civilisation in fact is already demonstrated to be in the hands of the men and women of goodwill. They can, if they choose to do so, create a constructive and sound public opinion of greater pressure and effectiveness than any other group can produce. The ideological fighters are organised and generally well financed. The commercial interests are in like position, but the economic pressures produced by the mishandling and wrong distribution of the abundance which nature provides proves the best laid plans abortive. There is today no stable and safe factor in the body of humanity itself on which we can depend, except the will to common good in the hearts of the intelligent men and women in the world today.

A new and better ideology is in reality little more than something else to fight about. A new government machinery or system of representation, a shifting of political power from one set of people to another and the now somewhat popular idea of a super world government (which could not possibly last very long without an accompanying super world police power) are one and all fundamentally inadequate and futile without active public support from men of goodwill. This will produce those who are sufficiently broad-minded and public spirited to inform themselves about world affairs and sufficiently intelligent and wise to understand the need and usefulness of voluntary national sacrifices which are absolutely necessary for world stability and peace.

We must, therefore, realise that the success or failure of the United Nations rests in our hands more than in the hands of our delegates and that action must be taken outside the assembly rooms and corridors of the buildings in which it is housed. Those who represent us must have our attention, our interest and our active support. We must give them ready recognition and appreciation for every constructive action taken. We sell our birthright when we glance at our newspapers and, reflecting the thought of the news correspondent or the editorial, criticise and condemn the events of the day and continue to do nothing about it. Public support must be organised and stimulated and directed on a cooperative, mutual discussion basis, acceptable to intelligent people. Then our statesmen

can be more daring and speak for and actually make commitments on behalf of agreements and programmes that they know in their hearts should be followed but for which they now risk their personal future when they do more than hope for them.

Such groups of citizens interested in the United Nations do exist but in many cases they do not go beyond comfortably informative lectures. They seldom achieve the form of a definite conclusion and all too infrequently even pass a resolution. These organizations should be vitalized, supported and encouraged. Their existence should be publicised and their programmes made attractive. They should be stimulated to reach conclusions and take action. Their members should become students of world affairs and follow the actions of their representatives in the Assembly and Security Council. They should write letters of approval when wise action is taken. They should urge their delegates to continually press forward with these programmes and policies that are in fact for the common good.

Our delegates must become aware that there are people at home who will approve the more unselfish and humanitarian policies. With such support a spiritual climate can be created in which the United Nations can achieve its true usefulness and destiny. Without this sort of public opinion it is not unreasonable to think that the United Nations will go the way of the League of Nations and that the cold war will become a hot war and that through our own exhaustion and frustration, self-absorption and self-interest, we, the people, will have sold ourselves into long ages of dark misery and human degradation.

How can a nation legitimately sacrifice its own interests for the good of the whole world? A sacrifice to be worth while must not be over a trivial matter. No nation can justify to its own people drastic sacrifices if it has to act alone. But it would only take a small group of the more powerful nations, coming together with joint sacrifices, to create sufficient pressure and compel sufficient change in world conditions to ensure results. Many such efforts are in fact made but the special interests of particular groups which may be hurt are always actively in opposition. We should, therefore, be continually urging our delegates to look for such opportunities, to make adjustments necessary for bringing them about, and to try again and again to gain the immediate necessary support. Attention would then be focussed on constructive achievements for world welfare instead of weeks and months being devoted to frantic last-minute efforts to centralise and offset the results of unfortunate incidents and international crises that never should have arisen at all. With such a policy supported by the men of good will the evils of excessive nationalism have a chance of being cured.

A public campaign preaching the evils of nationalism would be as futile as the public campaigns after World War I, in which billions were spent to glorify the virtues of peace and to condemn the folly of war. A campaign for support of the United Nations must not again become a future peace crusade.

Experience teaches us that the public becomes articulate and gets busy about national and world affairs only when it is worried or sufficiently scared about the future. The public today is worried about international affairs and scared of another war, but it is far more worried about local economic conditions, the price of food and houses to live in. Should we attempt, therefore, to scare the people of the world enough so that there would be a powerful demand for world peace and economic adjustments? Many sincere people are engaged today in trying to use fear to whip the people up to action. Such a course is not only ill-considered and foolish, it is extremely dangerous and utterly wrong.

Frightened men always put the blame and the responsibility on someone else. A frightened populace becomes more nationalistic and separatist, more ridden by suspicion, more controlled by hate and in the end inevitably becomes more futile and more foolish. Indeed fear is the most powerful and successful agency of all the evil forces in the world. It is successfully used by the Kremlin as the chief undermining weapon by means of which surrounding peoples are rendered impotent and conquests are achieved without going to war. The internal spy systems, the secret police, the ruthless liquidation of opponents, the horror of slave labour, the abominations practiced by the dictators to control their own people and to bleed white the foolish nations that turn to them from across their own borders, all derive their chief effectiveness from the horrible fear under which the peoples live who are so dominated.

The increasing tempo of world fear must be offset by the men and women of good will, who have the courage to assert their own personal integrity and stake their future and base their action on the fundamental spiritual fact that the heart of humanity is sound.

The world war through which we have recently passed ended with a great spiritual victory for humanity. It demonstrated that the most powerful onslaught of the destructive forces of the planet, when focussed through the most efficiently powerful military organisations that could be produced, could not succeed in crushing the human spirit. It was a fight for human freedom, a fight to prevent the minds of men being controlled by the forces of evil. It was a fight to make sure that in the future the individual man should have the right to think for himself, to choose for himself, and work out his own destiny in the light of his own soul. It was in the deepest sense a holy war. The curious fallacy prevalent everywhere that only those things are spiritual which are dealt with in terms of religion is a piece of foolishness hard to understand.

The United Nations should be regarded as a great spiritual experiment. It should be understood as a champion of human rights over and above every other consideration. It should be the instrument used for achieving world understanding and perfecting world arrangements that are necessary to better the life of all men everywhere in the world, not only in material ways, but especially in terms of right human relations. It has been well said that our conquest of the kingdom of nature has too far out-run our conquest of the kingdom of man. It seems that we know all about everything except how to live decently together. We can control everything except our fears and our hatreds and our greeds, and these uncontrolled human factors lie at the root of all our miseries. The United Nations must be the champion of a new world policy of sharing. This has long been accepted as a sound spiritual ideal. It has now become a practical world necessity.

We have had two horrible wars in recent times and we have described the horror as total warfare because it involved the action of all people everywhere in every department of human living. Recently a policy of "Total diplomacy" has been proposed to implement the cold war victory. Total diplomacy, if rightly motivated and implemented, can help, provided we think clearly and understand what we are fighting for. It is good because under this slogan we can move out from our lethargy and dependence upon our statesmen alone and resume our rightful responsibility as citizens. But if our diplomacy is organised against a false enemy and leaves untouched the real evils rampant in the human family which cause all wars, it also will be in vain.

What then actually is our real enemy and what is the essential thing for which we must fight? Our real enemy is totalitarianism, the system of dictatorship over peoples and nations maintained and enforced through cruelty and fear, injustice and persecution, and by the use of a ruthless police power. It is totalitarianism that is the great antagonist of human freedom and the essence of the world problem remains today, as it was in the second world war, a fight for human freedom. The present cold war is as truly a holy war and a spiritual war as was the last and it should be so understood.

Our total diplomacy, therefore, is shooting in the air if it is motivated and supported by those who for ideological reasons or because of economic fears or for business profits, want to stamp out communism in the world in order to save capitalism. It is not a question of being pro- or anti-communism nor of being pro- or anti-Russia. If the people of any nation wish to follow a communistic ideology and remain in control of their nation so that they can change their policy and their government at their own will, we need have no fear for the economic welfare of the planet. But when any nation becomes helpless in the hands either of a dictator, or a group of dictators, who maintain their position largely through ignorance, fear, and cruelty, then that people is in danger of losing the most precious possession of all mankind, the right of the individual man to live as a free son of God.

Dictatorship may be complete or partial, it may be ruthless and obvious or controlled by indirection and with disguised skill; it can thrive on wornout thought patterns and childish prejudices and habits, which should have been outgrown. It thrives the most easily on abject misery and such dictatorships therefore seek to use misery and suffering by every possible means because their path is made easier, just in proportion as the human spirit is crushed.

There was some excuse, but not very much, for the intelligent people of Germany to have been led astray and to have succumbed to the ruthless cruelty and fantastic superman claims of the Nazis. There is very real excuse and need of understanding for the great mass of people in Russia. The enemies of mankind now focussed in the Kremlin have profited by every device perfected by the Nazis and they seek to avoid all the mistakes that Hitler made. But, they are

not the Russian people and they care no more for communism, except to use it to dope their people, than Hitler did for social democracy.

Totalitarianism is also found in many other places outside of Russia. It seems that we pay attention to Russia only because she is bigger and more powerful and more feared than other dictator states and groups. We make a basic error in not recognizing the real enemy and in not employing a total diplomacy throughout the entire world against that enemy.

Today our fear is being focused upon the horrors of a possible World War III and we are being urged to action to avoid it. We should remember that it is quite possible that we may be able to avoid such a third war and still we may destroy our present civilization and plunge the world into a long dark age of misery and ruin, if we cannot manage to convert enough of humanity to real spiritual democracy practically applied to the affairs of men.

Again we hear the cry for peace, which is only a fear cry to escape war. The men and women of good will everywhere must raise their voices and take the individual action necessary to focus a spiritual cry in a powerful demand for freedom. Then we shall not only escape war and have the blessings of peace but our civilization will rest upon the sure foundation of right human relations. World affairs must be controlled by the intelligent cooperation of those people in the world whose lives respond to the divine motive of good will toward men. The United Nations can, if we so choose, be the instrument for this great spiritual victory, because it can gather together the great statesmen of the world and implement their efforts in ways that are practical and effective. The world needs the United Nations. It is the best instrument we have. The men of good will can make it successful.

FOSTER BAILEY.

(If you wish to have additional copies of this pamphlet to pass on to your friends or would like to assist in the distribution, please write to: World Goodwill, 11 West 42d Street, New York 36, N. Y. International Headquarters: 38 Broadwater Down, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, England. European Office: 25 Rue de Chantepoulet, Geneva, Switzerland.)

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF GLENN F. TURNER, OF MADISON, WIS., DIRECTOR OF THE ESPERANTO FOUNDATION, MEMBER OF THE ESPERANTO LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA, THE UNIVERSALA LIGO, AND BROADCASTER ON THE WEEKLY RADIO PROGRAM, ESPERANTO NOW, ON WMFM, MADISON

This statement is personal but we believe it has the support of more than 16 million people who have petitioned the U. N. for the adoption of Esperanto and the friends of Esperanto everywhere in the world.

According to the polls which have been taken in the United States, Canada, Holland, Norway, Finland, and France, more than 75 percent of the people favor the adoption and teaching in the schools of a common language. We believe that all the literate countries would furnish similar results.

There is however no agreement on the teaching of a national language. Most people favor the adoption of their language but are opposed to the adoption of any other national language because of the advantage it would give to that country in world affairs. And so there is no proposal to adopt any national language which has any support of people in other countries which do not use the language.

If a common language is selected we believe that it will be Esperanto, for Esperanto has been endorsed by people in every country outside of the Iron Curtain who are free to do so.

In addition to several million people who endorse Esperanto it has been endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church and most other churches, by labor organizations, by chambers of commerce of all the great commercial countries, by radio, telegraph organizations, by travel organizations, by the Red Cross, and so forth.

We therefore urge that your subcommittee suggest that the Charter of the U. N. be amended to provide for the adoption of Esperanto as the language of the U. N.; that the U. N. charter be amended to urge the proper educational authorities to introduce Esperanto into the schools and its use on TV, radio, and the movies to the end that it can soon be the only language of translation at the U. N. meetings and for its eventual use as the language of the U. N.

If the U. N. is to be amended to form a federal union which can prevent war as many of us think it must be, a common language must be adopted, for a union will be unable to function without a common language. If, on the other hand, the U. N. charter is to remain as it is, we believe it needs a common language to function at its highest efficiency.

If on the other hand the U. N. is abolished and complete international anarchy is to replace the almost complete anarchy we now have in world affairs, a common language is even more necessary and should be promoted by the adoption of Esperanto by the U. N. before it goes out of existence. For anarchy would have a much better chance to function among people who could understand each other than in the world divided by languages as it is now.

We therefore hope that the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs will do its best to get the State Department to reverse its opposition to the Esperanto petition and support Esperanto at the coming meeting of UNESCO at Montevideo this fall but if unsuccessful, it will do what it can to bring up the matter at the charter-revision meeting.

X